

Modern Philology

VOLUME XVIII

March 1921

NUMBER 11

"AND THE EVENING AND THE MORNING WERE ONE DAY"

Paradiso, XXVII, 136-38

St. Augustine tells us that the angels are not omitted from the account of the creation in Genesis, but where it is said: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," "heaven" signifies spiritual beings in a potential state, just as "earth" signifies material creatures in an unformed state. And where it is said: "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light," the word "light" signifies the angels in their actual condition.¹

. . . non mihi videtur ab operibus Dei absurda sententia, si cum lux illa prima facta est, Angeli creati intelliguntur, et inter sanctos Angelos et immundos fuisse discretum, ubi dictum est: "Et divisit Deus inter lucem et tenebras; et vocavit Deus lucem diem, et tenebras vocavit noctem. . . ." ²

The light, then, and the day are the angels, and the darkness and the night are the sinning angels, as soon as they are separated from the good. So also says St. Isidore: "Angelica natura, quae non est

¹ Cf. Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXVII, Art. IV: "Augustinus enim (*De Civ. Dei* Lib. XI, cap. ix et xxxiii) videtur dicere quod non fuerit conveniens Moysem praetermisisse spiritualis creaturae productionem. Et ideo dicit quod cum dicitur: *In principio creavit Deus coelum et terram*, per coelum intelligitur materia informis corporalis creaturae. Et quia natura spiritualis dignior est quam corporalis, fuit prius formanda. Formatio igitur spiritualis naturae significatur in productione lucis, ut intelligatur de luce spiritali. Formatio enim naturae spiritualis est per hoc quod illuminatur ut adhaeret Verbo Dei."

² S. Aur. Augustini *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. xix. *Op. om.* ed. Caillaud and Guillon, Paris, 1836, Vol. III, p. 32.

prevaricata, lux dicitur; illa autem quae prevaricata est tenebrarum nomine nuncupatur. Unde et in principio lux a tenebris dividitur."¹

This was a favorite idea with St. Augustine, which he discusses in many chapters of his *De Genesi ad litteram* and his *De Civitate Dei* as well as in other works; and with it is intimately connected his doctrine of the "evening and morning knowledge" of the angels. For how came it that some of the angels deviated from the light, became darkness, and were called "night"; while the others were called "day"? It happened in this way: The angels (who are altogether spiritual creatures, and so do not understand by means of abstractions from sense-images, as do human beings) have two kinds of knowledge. They see all things, including themselves, as they are in the Divine Wisdom which creates them, by gazing directly upon the light of Divine Wisdom, and this is their more perfect kind of knowledge. They also see all things, including themselves, as these creatures are in themselves, and this is their less perfect kind of knowledge. The more perfect is called "morning" knowledge, the less perfect "evening" knowledge.² When God said "Let there be light" he recalled his spiritual creatures from their contemplation of themselves as they were in themselves, to the contemplation of all things in him, and all but a minority converted their gaze upon him, gratefully acknowledging their own being from him, and ascribing all the creation to his praise. They thus acquired their full perfection.³ The minority, on the contrary, refused to convert their gaze upon him, but continued to contemplate themselves and the rest of the creation as they were

¹ S. Isidori *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. viii, *Op. om.* (ed. Migne), Tom. V, No. 129.

² Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LVII, Art. VI: "Respondeo dicendum quod hoc quod dicitur de cognitione matutina et vespertina in angelis, introductum est ab Augustino. . . . Sicut autem in die consueto mane est principium diei, vespere autem terminus; ita cognitio ipsius primordialis esse rerum dicitur cognitio matutina; et haec est secundum quod res sunt in Verbo. Cognitio autem ipsius esse rei creatae secundum quod in propria natura consistit, dicitur cognitio vespertina. Nam esse rerum fluit a Verbo sicut a quodam primordiali principio; et hic effluxus terminatur ad esse rerum quod in propria natura habet."

³ Augustine *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. vii (ed. cit., Vol. III, p. 14): "Quoniam scientia creaturae in comparatione scientiae Creatoris quodammodo vesperscit: itemque lucescit et mane fit, cum et ipsa refertur ad laudem dilectionemque Creatoris; nec in noctem vergitur, ubi non Creator creaturae dilectione relinquitur. . . . Cognitio quippe creaturae in se ipsa decoloratior est, ut ita dicam, quam cum in Dei Sapientia cognoscitur, velut in arte qua facta est. Ideo vespere congruentius quam nox dici potest: quae tamen, ut dixi, cum ad laudandum et amandum refertur Creatorem, recurrit in mane. . . ."

in themselves, rejoicing in their beauty, and refusing to acknowledge that beauty from God. They preferred their "evening" knowledge to their "morning" knowledge, and aspired to obtain by themselves that perfection which the majority gained by conversion to their "morning" knowledge. Then it happened that the "evening" knowledge of the rebellious angels became darkened, and turned to "night."¹ But the holy angels who obeyed the summons to convert their gaze did not on that account lose their "evening" knowledge, for they have both "morning" and "evening" knowledge combined in their "day" knowledge, as they contemplate the light of the Divine Wisdom, that light of which they are themselves an emanation.² In other words, they understand the creation as it is in the Divine Wisdom, and they understand it also as it is in itself, without averting their gaze from the light of the Word.

All this is signified by the Scriptures, for when God said, "Let there be light," then the light (that is the angels) became perfected. "And God saw the light" (that is the spiritual creature) "that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness" (that is the good from the bad angels). "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night."

And the evening and the morning were one day.³

Here we depart from the English version to follow the Latin Vulgate. Why does the Scripture say that the evening and the morning were

¹ Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXIII, Art. VI: "Ad quartum dicendum. . . . Sic igitur instans primum in angelis intelligitur respondere operationi mentis angelicae, quae se in seipsam convertit per vespertinam cognitionem; quia in primo die commemoratur vespere, sed non mane. Et haec quidem operatio in omnibus bona fuit. Sed ab hac operatione quidam per matutinam cognitionem ad laudem Verbi sunt conversi. Quidam vero in seipsis remanentes, facti sunt nox per superbiam intumescentes, ut Augustinus dicit (*Sup. Gen. ad litt. Lib. IV, cap. xxiv*). Et sic prima operatio fuit omnibus communis: sed in secunda sunt distincti. Et illo in primo instanti omnes fuerunt boni, sed in secundo fuerunt boni a malis distincti."

² Augustine *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. IV, cap. xxix (*ed cit.*, Vol. V, p. 291): "Quamobrem potest aliquis fortasse mecum disputando certare, ut dicat sublimium coelorum Angelos non alternatim contueri, primo rationes creaturarum incommutabiliter in Verbi Dei incommutabili veritate, ac deinde ipsas creaturas, et tertio earum etiam in se ipsis cognitionem ad laudem referre Creatoris, sed eorum mentem mirabili facilitate haec omnia simul posse. Numquid tamen dicet, aut si quisquam dixerit audiendus est, illam coelestem in Angelorum millibus civitatem, aut non contemplari Creatoris aeternitatem, aut mutabilitatem ignorare creaturae, aut ex ejus quoque inferiore quadam cognitione laudare Creatorem? Simul hoc totum possint, simul hoc totum faciant: possunt tamen et faciunt. Simul ergo habent et diem, et vespem, et mane."

³ . . . factumque est vespere et mane, *dies unus*.

"one day," whereas with regard to the other days of the creation it uses ordinal numbers, even in the Vulgate, saying: "*factum est vespere et mane, dies secundus . . . dies tertius, etc.*"? It is to signify the unity of the angelic nature which was the first day, that is, when the good angels are converted from their evening to their morning, they are perfected, just as the day by which they are signified is complete. As St. Isidore says:

Dies prior factus angeli sunt, quorum propter unitatem insinuandam non dies primus, sed dies dictus est unus. Qui dies, hoc est natura angelorum, quando creaturam ipsam contemplabantur, quodammodo vesperecebat; non autem permanendo in ejus creaturae contuitu, sed laudem ejus ad Deum referens, eamque melius in divina ratione conspiciens, continuo mane fiebat. Si vero permaneret, neglecto Creatore, in creaturae aspectu jam non vespera, sed nox utique fieret. . . . Quia dum suam in se cognitionem sibi satisfacere non agnosceret, ut se plenius nosse potuisset, ad Deum esse referebat creatura, in quo dies se agnoscendo melius fieret.¹

And St. Augustine says:

Nimirum ergo si ad istorum dierum opera Dei pertinent Angeli, ipsi sunt lux illa, quae dei nomen accepit, cujus unitas ut commendaretur, non est dictus dies primus, sed dies unus. . . . Cum enim dixit Deus: "Fiat lux," "et facta est lux"; si recte in hac luce creatio intelligitur Angelorum, profecto facti sunt participes lucis aeternae, quod est ipsa incommutabilis Sapientia Dei.²

The day which is thus completed by the conversion of the angels from evening to morning knowledge has no night. It is the evening knowledge of the sinning angels that is darkened into night. This day is evening completed by morning, and both at the same time, since, as we have seen,³ the good angels do not lose their evening knowledge (that is the knowledge of things as they are in themselves) when they are converted to morning knowledge.⁴ In con-

¹ *Sententiarum Lib. I, cap. viii (ed. cit., Vol. VI, No. 130).*

² *De Civitate Dei Lib. XI, cap. ix (ed. cit., Vol. III, pp. 17-18).*

³ Cf. above p. 115, n. 2, "Simul ergo habent et diem, et vespeream, et mane."

⁴ *De Civitate Dei Lib. XI, cap. viii (ed. cit., Vol. III, p. 14):* "Denique Scriptura cum illos dies dinumeraret ex ordine, nusquam interposuit vocabulum noctis, non enim ait alicubi: 'Facta est nox': sed, 'Facta est vespera, et factum est mane dies unus.'"

Summa Theologica, I, Qu. LVIII, Art. VI: "Et ideo post vespeream non ponitur nox, sed mane; ita quod mane sit finis praecedentis diei, et principium sequentis, inquantum angelii cognitionem praecedentis operis ad laudem Dei referunt. *Ibid.*, Art. VII: Ad secundum dicendum, quod duae operationes possunt simul esse unius potentiae, quarum una ad aliam refertur; . . . Cognitio autem vespertina in angelis refertur ad matutinam, ut Augustinus dicit. . . . Unde nihil prohibet utramque simul esse in angelis."

verting the good angels to morning knowledge God does not deprive them of evening knowledge.

The above-mentioned considerations may have some bearing on the frequently discussed lines of Dante (*Paradiso*, XXVII, 136-38):

Così si fa la pelle bianca nera,
Nel primo aspetto della bella figlia
Di quei che apporta mane e lascia sera.

I am inclined to think that "Quei che apporta mane e lascia sera" is not the sun, as is usually supposed, but God himself. Doubtless a reference to the sun is implied. In *Convivio*, III, 12, Dante says that no material creature is more worthy than the sun to be used as a symbol for God, and he continues with a comparison, in which, by the way, the relation of the deity to the good and bad angels has its place. But in this passage of the *Paradiso* it seems to me that the sun is only referred to in order to distinguish God from it, for the sun cannot bring the morning without having first removed the evening by his departure, and brought on the night, whereas God brings to the angels an everlasting morning without depriving them of the evening, as we have seen. In fact this same distinguishing comparison is made by St. Augustine in the thirtieth chapter of the *De Genesi*, Book IV, the twenty-ninth being a single paragraph entitled: "In angelica cognitione dies, vespera et mane," which ends with the words already familiar to us: "Simul ergo habent diem, et vesperam, et mane." Then St. Augustine continues:

Neque enim verendum est, ne forte qui est idoneus jam illa sentire, ideo non putet hoc ibi posse fieri, quia in his diebus, qui solis hujus circuitu peraguntur, fieri non potest. Et hoc quidem non potest eisdem partibus terrae: universum autem mundum quis non videt, si attendere velit, et diem ubi sol est, et noctem ubi non est, et vesperam unde discedit, et mane quo accedit, simul habere? Sed nos plane in terris haec omnia simul habere non possumus: nec ideo tamen istam terrenam conditionem lucisque corporeae temporalem localemque circuitum illi patriae spiritali coaequare debemus, ubi semper est dies in contemplatione incommutabilis veritatis, semper vespera in cognitione in se ipsa creaturae, semper mane etiam ex hac cognitione in laude Creatoris. Quia non ibi abscessu lucis superioris, sed inferioris cognitionis distinctione fit vespera; nec mane tanquam nocti ignorantiae scientia matutina succedat, sed quod vespertinam etiam cognitionem in gloriam Conditoris attollat. Denique et ille nocte non nominata,

"Vespere, inquit, et mane et meridie enarrabo et annuntiabo; et exaudies vocem meam:" hic fortasse per temporum vices, sed tamen quantum puto significans quid sine temporum vicibus ageretur in patria, cui ejus peregrinatio suspirabat.

It is not in heaven as on earth: in heaven the evening does not come only when the light is departing, and the morning does not follow the night, but comes to brighten the evening ("Quia non ibi abscessu," etc.): God brings the morning to be with the evening, a thing the sun cannot do.

And so it appears to me that "Quei che apporta mane e lascia sera" means in modern Italian: "Quegli che arreca la mattina e non toglie la sera."¹ He is indeed a "sun," but a greater sun than that which rises and sets for the earth. He is the sun of the angels, as Beatrice calls him when she and Dante are in the sphere of the lesser sun.²

If we adopt the hypothesis that "Quei che apporta mane e lascia sera" is God, who then is "la bella figlia," the daughter of God, in the first aspect of whom the skin changes from white to black? It will be remembered that in the *Convivio* Dante calls Philosophy "figlia d'Iddio, regina di tutto";³ "la bellissima e onestissima figlia dello Imperadore dell' universo";⁴ "sposa dell'Imperadore del Cielo . . . e non solamente sposa, ma suora e figlia diletissima."⁵ He defines philosophy as "uno amoroso uso di Sapienza"⁶ because, as he explains, wisdom is its subject and love is its form.⁷ It may be human, angelic, or divine according to the different capabilities of men, angels, and God, but it is "massimamente in Dio, perocchè in Lui è somma Sapienza e sommo Amore e sommo Atto, che non può essere altrove se non in quanto da Esso procede."⁸ Dante's "Filosofia," then, although properly thus named by Pythagoras with special regard to human philosophy,⁹ is

¹ The opposite of *apportare* is *torre*, as in *Convivio* (ed. Moore), IV, 12, ll. 39-42: "Promettono le false traditrici, se ben si guarda, di torre ogni sete e ogni mancanza, e apportar saziamento e bastanza."

² *Paradiso*, X, 51-53: "Ringrazia il Sol degli Angeli, ch'a questo Sensibil t'ha levato per sua grazia."

³ *Convivio*, II, 13, ll. 71-72.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 16, ll. 101-3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 12, ll. 115-18.

⁶ *Ibid.*, III, 12, ll. 94-95.

⁷ *Ibid.*, III, 14, ll. 7-9.

⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 12, ll. 95-99.

⁹ *Ibid.*, III, 11, ll. 22-53.

no other than the loving wisdom of God which is called by St. Augustine: "aeterna illa et incommutabilis, quae non est facta, sed genita Sapientia,"¹ and "ipsa Dei Sapientia, quae non creata est, sed nata. . . ."² Love and Wisdom are inseparable in God as elsewhere, they are as form and subject, soul and body,³ and both together are continually represented to us as light. "Essa è candore dell' eterna Luce," says Dante quoting the Book of Wisdom,⁴ "quella luce virtuosissima, Filosofia,"⁵ and St. Augustine: "nata de Deo lux, est ipsa Dei Sapientia."⁶ According to this hypothesis, therefore, "la bella figlia," in the lines we are discussing, is that light of eternal wisdom which was in God before the heavens were created and the angels were formed of light.

Cum enim dixit Deus: "Fiat lux, et facta est lux"; si recte in hac luce creatio intelligitur Angelorum, profecto facti sunt participes lucis aeternae, quod est ipsa incommutabilis Sapientia Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia, quem dicimus unigenitum Dei Filium; ut ea luce illuminati, qua creati: fierent lux et vocarentur dies participatione incommutabilis lucis et diei, quod est Verbum Dei, per quod et ipsi et omnia facti sunt. "Lumen quippe verum quod illuminat omnem hominem in hunc mundum venientem," hoc illuminat et omnem Angelum mundum, ut sit lux non in se ipso, sed in Deo: a quo si avertitur Angelus, fit immundus; . . .⁷

These words of St. Augustine remind us that the angels are themselves the light that was created by the eternal light of the wisdom of God when the Word was uttered: "Let there be light."⁸ And since the angels are the first creatures of God, it might reasonably be said that they are the "first aspect" of that light, the "primo aspetto della bella figlia." Indeed the distinction between that

¹ *De Civitate Dei* Lib. I, cap. xvii (ed. cit., Vol. III, p. 180).

² *De Genesi ad litteram, imperfectus lib.*, cap. v (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 124).

³ *Conv.*, III, 14, ll. 6-10 and 15, ll. 119-20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 15, l. 54.

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, 1, l. 95.

⁶ *De Genesi ad litteram, imperfectus lib.*, loc. cit.

⁷ *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. ix (ed. cit., Vol. III, pp. 17-18).

⁸ St. Augustine insists that the word "light" is not used metaphorically for the angels, although in a sense different from the usual. *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. IV, cap. xxviii (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 289). St. Thomas modifies this statement with a subtle distinction: "Si ergo accipiat nomen luminis secundum suam primam impositionem, metaphorice in spiritualibus dicitur, . . . si autem accipiat secundum quod est in usu loquentium ad omnem manifestationem extensum, sic proprie in spiritualibus dicitur" (*Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXVII, Art. I).

first light which is the angels,¹ before which there was no light in the universe, and that eternal light of Wisdom which created it, is not easy to make, all the more since the angels are also called "Sapientia"; nevertheless it is a distinction which it is necessary to make, according to St. Augustine:

Si autem spiritalis lux facta est, cum dixit Deus, "Fiat lux"; non illa vera Patri coaeterna intelligenda est, per quam facta sunt omnia, et quae illuminat omnem hominem; sed illa de qua dici potuit, "Prior omnium creata est Sapientia." Cum enim aeterna illa et incommutabilis, quae non est facta, sed genita Sapientia, in spiritales atque rationales creaturas, sicut in animas sanctas se transfert, ut illuminatae lucere possint, fit in eis quaedam luculentae rationis affectio, quae potest accipi facta lux, cum diceret Deus: "Fiat lux";²

The word "aspetto" is used very frequently by Dante, always in one of two senses: it may mean the *view* which anyone may have of anything,³ or it may mean the *appearance* of anyone or anything.⁴ The word "primo" may also be used in one of two senses: it may mean *first* in the order of origin, or natural order (e.g., as the creation of the unformed heaven and earth preceded that of the formed, before time was);⁵ or it may mean *first* in the order of succession or duration, that is *first* in order of time.

Accordingly, the expression "primo aspetto," as applied to the light of the Divine Wisdom, may have the following meanings: "Primo aspetto" *a*, 1: The *primary*, i.e., the most direct, *view* of the light of the wisdom of God—that which the angels have. *a*, 2: The *primary appearance* of the light of the wisdom of God—that which is the angels. *b*, 1: The *earliest view*⁶ of the light of the

¹ "Lux illa prima," *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XI, cap. xix (ed. cit., Vol. III, p. 32).

² *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. I, cap. xvii (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 180); also Lib. I, cap. viii (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 202): "Conditio vero coeli prius erat in Verbo Dei secundum genitam Sapientiam; deinde facta est in creatura spiritali, hoc est, in cognitione Angelorum secundum creatam in illis sapientiam," and again in *De Genesi imperfectus liber*, cap. v (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 124): "Alia est lux de Deo nata, et alia lux quam fecit Deus: nata de Deo lux, est ipsa Dei Sapientia; facta vero lux, est quaelibet mutabilis, sive corporea sive incorporea."

³ *Convivio*, III, 13, ll. 15-17: "Per che si vede che le infernali Intelligenze dello aspetto di questa bellissima sono private."

⁴ *Ibid.*, 15, ll. 6-10: "Cose appaiacon nello suo aspetto. . . . Dice adunque lo testo, che nella faccia di costei appaiono cose che. . . ."

⁵ *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXVI, Art. IV.

⁶ Any expression in terms of time, regarding the knowledge of the angels, must be taken metaphorically, since the angels are previous to time in the natural order. *Summa Theologica*, loc. cit.

wisdom of God—that which the angels have. *b*, 2: The *earliest appearance* of the light of the wisdom of God—that which is the angels.¹

The two meanings of "aspetto" (*view* and *appearance*) are not always distinguishable from one another. They tend to be fused in one just as do the active and passive elements in perception and understanding. St. Thomas speaking of the understanding of angels says: "In his qui sunt sine materia, idem est intellectus et quod intelligitur; ac si diceretur, quod intellectus in actu est intellectus in actu."² The two meanings of "primo" (*primary* and *earliest*) are also not necessarily distinguished, and the word is often used without any such distinction, as e.g., when the angels are referred to as the *first* creatures. And so the expression "primo aspetto" may properly be used at the same time in all of the four senses that have been defined. I believe that Dante is using it in this composite general sense in the passage we are considering.

The light of the Divine Wisdom floods the Empyrean, and streams directly upon the angels who are informed by it and reflect it like mirrors—"specchi," the word used by Dante.³ They are thus the first reflection of the light of God's wisdom, and at the same time they participate in that light so intimately that they are properly called by the same names "sapientia" and "lux." They are, in fact, the very wisdom of God in its created aspect, which is referred to in the words quoted⁴ by Dante: "Ond' è scritto di Lei: 'Dal principio dinanzi dalli secoli creata sono'"; and in this sense Wisdom herself may be called a mirror: "Essa è candore dell' eterna Luce; specchio senza macola della maestà di Dio."⁵ St. Isidore sums the matter up as follows:

Ante omnem creaturam angeli facti sunt, dum dictum est *Fiat lux*; de ipsis enim dicit Scriptura: *Prior omnium creata est sapientia*. Lux enim

¹ Speaking absolutely, the *primo aspetto* of the Divine Wisdom, both in the sense of *primary* and (metaphorically) *earliest, view* and *appearance*, is the view which God has of his own wisdom and the appearance of that wisdom in himself upon which he looks. But, in the passage we are considering, Beatrice is speaking as a creature to a fellow-creature, and it is obvious that the Divine Wisdom, as considered in relation to God alone, can undergo no blackening process. *Convivio*, III, 13, ll. 1-6.

² *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LV, Art. I.

³ *Paradiso*, IX, 61, et alibi.

⁴ *Convivio*, III, 14, ll. 58-59.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 15, ll. 54-55.

dicuntur participando luci aeternae. Sapientia enim dicuntur ingenitae inhaerendo Sapientiae.¹

That light which the angels reflect, and with which they are informed, is also transmitted by them to their inferiors in the angelic hierarchy and to men on earth, "subobscure," as the Pseudo-Dionysius says, since the light, in transmission, loses in clarity.² This double function of theirs (the reflection and transmission of the light) corresponds to their morning and evening knowledge, which, as we have seen, they have simultaneously in one and the first day.³ By means of this transmission men enjoy the "secondo aspetto," a secondary inferior view of the light of Divine Wisdom. "Onde nelle Intelligenze raggia la divina luce senza mezzo, nell'altre si ripercuote da queste Intelligenze prima illuminate,"⁴ says Dante, and again: "discendo a mostrare come nella umana intelligenza essa secondariamente ancora venga,"⁵ so in the lines,

Fin che il piacere eterno, che diretto
Raggiava in Beatrice, dal bel viso
Mi contentava col secondo aspetto,⁶

the poet means that he enjoyed the secondary view which is the privilege of mortals on earth. Just as in the angels is the "primo aspetto," so in men on earth is the "secondo aspetto."

But if the angelic nature may properly be said both to have and to be the "first aspect" of the light of Divine Wisdom, that name is applicable in an altogether peculiar manner to the angel who was created first of all the angels, pre-eminent over all in knowledge and

¹ *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. x (ed. cit., Vol. VI, No. 135); cf. also P. Lombardi *Sententiarum* Lib. II, dist. II. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Paris, 1880, Tom. II, col. 1): "Unde illud, *Eccl.* I: 'Primo omnium creata est sapientia,' quod intelligitur de angelica natura quae in Scriptura saepe vita, sapientia et lux dicitur. Nam sapientia illa quae Deus est, creata non est."

² S. Dionysii Areopag. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Vol. I, *De Coel. Hierarchia*, p. 239).

³ *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. II, cap. viii (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 202): "Neque enim sicut nos ad percipiendam sapientiam proficiebant Angeli, ut invisibilia Dei per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspicerent, qui ex quo creati sunt, ipsi Verbi aeternitate sancta et pia contemplatione perfuuntur; atque inde desipientes, secundum id quod intus vident, vel recte facta approbant, vel peccata improbant."

⁴ *Convivio*, III, 14, ll. 35-37.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, 13, ll. 22-24.

⁶ *Paradiso*, XVIII, 16-18.

beauty. This angel is Lucifer, named from the light itself.¹ Of him says Isidore:

Ante omnem creationem mundi creati sunt angeli, et ante omnem creationem angelorum diabolus conditus est, sicut scriptum est: *Ipsa est principium viarum Dei*, etc.²

And St. Gregory:

Prima et nobilior creatura fuit angelus qui cecidit . . . quia nimirum cum cuncta creans ageret, hunc primum condidit, quem reliquis angelis eminentiorem fecit. Hujus primatus eminentiam conspicit propheta cum dicit: *Cedri non fuerunt altiores illo in paradiso Dei; abietes non adaequaverunt summitatem ejus; platani non fuerunt aquae frondibus illius; omne lignum paradisi Dei non est assimilatum illi et pulchritudini ejus, quoniam speciosum fecit eum in multis condensisque frondibus* (Ezech. 31:8-9). Qui namque accipi in cedris, abietibus et platanis possunt, nisi illa virtutum coelestium procerae celsitudinis agmina in aeternae laetitiae viriditate plantata? Quae quamvis excelsa sint condita, huic tamen nec praelata sunt nec aequata. Qui speciosus factus in multis condensisque frondibus esse dicitur, quia praelatum caeteris legionibus, tanta illum species pulchriorem reddidit, quanta et supposita angelorum multitudo decoravit. Ista arbor in paradiso Dei tot quasi condensas frondes habuit, quot sibi suppositas superiorum spirituum legiones attendit. Qui idcirco peccans sine venia damnatus est, quia magnus sine comparatione fuerat creatus. Hinc ei rursum per eundem prophetam dicitur: *Tu signaculum similitudinis Dei, plenus sapientia et perfectus decore, in deliciis paradisi Dei fuisti* (Ezech. 28:12, 13). Multa enim de ejus magnitudine locuturus, primo verbo cuncta complexus est. Quid namque boni non habuit, si signaculum Dei similitudinis fuit? . . .

And he continues expounding another passage of Ezechiel in the same sense.³

Gregory is corroborated as follows by Petrus Lombardus:

Et in Ezechiele legitur, c. 28: Tu signaculum similitudinis. . . . Quod Gregorius exponens ait, in illo imago Dei similis insinuatur impressa. Item in Ezechiele legitur, c. 25: Omnis lapis pretiosus operimentum ejus, id est,

¹ *Purgatorio*, XII, 25-26: ". . . colui che fu nobil creato Più ch'altra creatura, . . ." *Inferno*, XXXIV, 18: "la creatura ch'ebbe il bel semblante."

² *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. x (ed. cit., Tom. VI, No. 135).

³ S. Gregorii Papae cogn. Magni *Moralium*, Lib. IV, cap. xxiii. *Op. omni.* (ed. Migne, Tom. I, nn. 1071-73); also *Homiliarum* Lib. II, homilia xxxiv (ed. cit., Tom. II, n. 1604): "Omnis lapis pretiosus operimentum tuum: sardius, topazius, et jaspis, chrysolithus, onyx, et beryllus, sapphirus, carbunculus, et smaragdus (Ezech. 25:13). Ecce novem dixit nomina lapidum, quia profecto novem sunt ordines angelorum. Quibus nimirum ordinibus ille primus angelus ideo ornatus et opertus exstitit, quia dum cunctis agminibus angelorum praelatus est, ex eorum comparatione clarior fuit."

omnis angelus quasi operimentum ejus erat, quia, ut dicit Gregorius, *hom. 34 super Isai*: In aliorum comparatione caeteris clarior fuit, unde vocatus est Lucifer, sicut testatur Isaias, c. 14: Quomodo, inquit, cecidisti, Lucifer, qui mane oriebaris?¹

. . . Lucifer qui fuit de collegio superiorum [angelorum] ipsis etiam dignior exstitit, qui aliis excellentiores creati fuerant.²

And also by St. Thomas:

Et ideo Gregorius dicit, quod ille qui peccavit fuit superior inter omnes. Et hoc videtur probabilius; quia peccatum angeli non processit ex aliqua pronitate, sed ex solo libero arbitrio. Unde magis videtur consideranda esse ratio quae sumitur a motivo ad peccandum.³

When God said, "Let there be light," there sprang into being myriads of beautiful forms of light varying in brightness, who almost immediately converted their gaze from themselves and the worlds below them, to the source of the light, and so became at once brighter than before. But the most dazzling of all, the very counterpart of the Wisdom of God, remained averted, unwilling to admit that so brilliant a creature as himself could have been created by another. And so did others of the glorious creatures following the evil example. And at once their brightness began to fade, and they became dark. Their evening knowledge, which they preferred, could not survive without being wedded to the morning knowledge and perpetuated in day knowledge: it darkened into night: "et vocavit Deus lucem diem, et tenebras vocavit noctem."

If, then, the expression "primo aspetto" connotes the angelic nature as first created, it specifically denotes the first angel, "first" in both the chief meanings of the word, in whom the angelic nature degenerated, in whom the white skin of the beautiful daughter of him who brings morning to the angels without removing evening became blackened.

The sin that is denounced by Beatrice in our passage which begins: "O cupidigia, che i mortali affonde" is covetousness, that general sin which includes all others, which is the common disease of the whole world, which is the same as St. Augustine's "amor

¹ P. Lombardi *Sententiarum* Lib. II, dist. vi. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Tom. II, col. 662).

² *Ibid.*, dist. ix. *Op. omn.* (ed. Migne, Tom. II, col. 671).

³ *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXIII, Art. VII.

privatus," love of self. This is the sin that caused Lucifer to fall; the sin that, in his case, is often called pride:

Merito initium omnis peccatum Scriptura definivit, dicens: "Initium omnis peccati superbia." Cui testimonio non inconvenienter aptatur etiam illud, quod Apostolus ait: "Radix omnium malorum est avaritia": si avaritiam generalem intelligamus, qua quisque appetit aliquid amplius quam oportet, propter excellentiam suam, et quendam rei amorem: cui sapienter nomen latina lingua indidit, cum appellavit privatum, quod potius a detrimento quam ab incremento dictum elucet. Omnis enim privatio minuit. Unde itaque vult eminere superbia inde in angustias egestatemque contruditur, cum ex communi ad proprium damno suo amore redigitur. Specialis est autem avaritia, quae usitatus appellatur amor pecuniae. Cujus nomine Apostolus per speciem genus significans, universalem avaritiam volebat intelligi dicendo: "Radix omnium malorum est avaritia." Hac enim et diabolus cecidit, qui utique non amavit pecuniam, sed propriam potestatem. Proinde perversus sui amor privat sancta societate turgidum spiritum, eumque coarctat miseria jam per iniquitatem satiari cupientem.¹

. . . . inordinatus amor sui est causa omnis peccati. In amore autem sui includitur inordinatus appetitus boni; unusquisque enim appetit bonum ei quem amat. Unde manifestum est quod inordinatus appetitus boni est causa omnis peccati.²

. . . . secundum quod cupiditas importat universaliter appetitum cuiuslibet boni, sic etiam superbia vitae continetur sub cupiditate.³

It must not be forgotten that the wisdom of God is with love. Dante, as we have seen, defines Philosophy as "uno amoroso uso della Sapienza; il quale massimamente è in Dio, . . ."⁴ and St. Thomas says:

Filius autem est Verbum, non quaecumque, sed spirans amorem. Unde Augustinus dicit (*De Trin.* Lib. IX, cap. x) "Verbum autem quod insinuare intendimus, cum amore notitia est." Non igitur secundum quamlibet perfectionem intellectus mittitur Filius, sed secundum talem instructionem intellectus, qua prorumpat in affectum amoris; . . .⁵

and accordingly Dante, describing the creation of the angels, unites the light of God's wisdom with his love:

Non per avere a sè di bene acquisto,
Ch' esser non può, ma perchè suo splendore
Potesse, risplendendo, dir: Sussisto;

.
S'aperse in nuovi amor l'eterno amore.⁶

¹ *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. XI, cap. xv (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 530).

² *Summa Theologica*, Prima Secundae, Qu. LXXVII, Art. V (ed. cit., Vol. III, p. 267).

³ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

⁴ *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. XLIII, Art. V.

⁵ *Convivio*, III, 12, ll. 94-96.

⁶ *Paradiso*, XXIX, 13-18.

In Lucifer both knowledge and love became perverted, and Lucifer is the head of the universal body of the wicked, which includes them all—fallen angels and degenerate men—just as Christ is the head of the universal body of the good—angels and men. On this consideration St. Augustine lays the foundations of his two “civitates,” “civitas Dei” and “civitas diaboli”:

Hi duo amores, quorum alter sanctus est, alter immundus; alter socialis, alter privatus; . . . praecesserunt in Angelis, alter in bonis, alter in malis; et distinxerunt conditas in genere humano civitates duas, sub admirabili et ineffabili providentia Dei, cuncta quae creata sunt administrantis et ordinantis, alteram justorum, alteram iniquorum.¹

The word “pelle” used by Dante in our passage suggests a body, and the analogy between the body of the devil and the body of God is widespread in the teachings of the early Fathers, and involves accurate distinctions, in interpreting the Scriptures, between passages which are to be understood as speaking of the head, and others which speak only of the body, while others still speak of both together.

In the *De Doctrina Christiana*, a work quoted by Dante himself in the *De Monarchia*, St. Augustine devotes eight chapters to a summary of the *Liber Regularum* of Tichonius, his contemporary, a book containing directions for interpreting the Scriptures, which the bishop of Hippo valued highly. The first rule is one for interpreting references to the body of God, which St. Augustine reports as follows:

Prima de Domino et ejus corpore est, in qua scientes aliquando capitis et corporis, id est, Christi et Ecclesiae unam personam nobis intimari . . . non haesitemus quando a capite ad corpus, vel a corpore transitur ad caput, et tamen non receditur ab una eademque persona. Una enim persona loquitur dicens: “Sicut sponso imposuit mihi mitram, et sicut sponsam ornavit me ornamento” (Isa. 61:10); et tamen quid horum duorum capiti, quid corpori, id est quid Christo, quid Ecclesiae conveniat, utique intelligendum est.²

From this explanation it appears that both head and body may be spoken of in the same passage, both the unity of the two and the distinction between the two being understood.

¹ *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. XI, cap. xv (ed. cit., Vol. V, p. 531).

² *De Doctrina Christiana* Lib. III, cap. xxxi (ed. cit., Vol. V, pp. 37-38).

The second rule is regarding references to the mixed body of God, inasmuch as the church is composed of both faithful and hypocrites, both good and bad. The example taken from Tichonius is from the Song of Solomon (Cant. I, 5): "*Fusca sum et speciosa ut tabernacula Cedar, ut pelles Salomonis*," in which it is necessary to explain how the church can be both "black" and "comely."¹

It is not likely that the words "*pelles Salomonis*"—"curtains of Solomon," suggested to Dante his "*pelle*" in our passage,² for another of the rules of Tichonius, the seventh, is concerned with references to the body of the devil:

Septima Tichonii regula est, eademque postrema, *de diabolo et ejus corpore*. Est enim et ipse caput impiorum, qui sunt ejus quodam modo corpus, ituri cum illo in supplicium ignis aeterni: sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae, quod est corpus ejus, futurum cum illo in regno et gloria sempiterna. Sicut ergo in prima regula, quam vocat *de Domino et ejus corpore*, vigilandum est ut intelligatur, cum de una eademque persona Scriptura loquitur, quid conveniat capiti, quid corpori; sic et in ista novissima, aliquando in diabolum dicitur, quod non in ipso, sed potius in ejus corpore possit agnosci, quod habet non solum in eis, qui manifestissime foris sunt, sed in eis etiam, qui, cum ad ipsum pertineant, tamen ad tempus miscentur Ecclesiae, . . .³

The body of the devil is recognized and explained as a symbol for the whole sum of the wicked by others beside St. Augustine following Tichonius, for example St. Gregory:

In Evangelio Veritas dicit: *Ego sum lux mundi* (Joan., VIII, 12). sicut autem isdem Redemptor noster una persona est cum congregatione bonorum; ipse namque caput est corporis, et nos hujus capitis corpus; ita autiquus hostis una persona est cum cuncta collectione reproborum, quia ipse eis ad iniquitatem quasi caput praeeminet, illi autem dum ad persuasa deserviunt, velut subjunctum capiti corpus inhaerent. Quod ergo de hac nocte, id est antiquo hoste dicitur, dignum est ut ad corpus ejus, id est ad iniquos quosque derivetur.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, cap. xxxii (ed. cit., p. 38).

² A better suggestion is in Gregory's comment on Job XL:26: "*Nunquid implebis sagenas pelle ejus, aut gurgustium piscium capite illius*." Subaudis, ut ego, qui intra Ecclesiam fidelium prius quasi pellem diaboli extremos atque infimos colligo, et post modum caput illius, id est prudentes mihi adversarios, subdo. *Moralium*, Lib. XXXIII, cap. xviii (ed. cit., Tom II, No. 1098).

³ *Ibid.*, cap. xxxvii, ed. cit., pp. 48-49.

⁴ *Moralium*, Lib. IV, cap. xi (ed. cit., Tom. I, No. 112). St. Isidore also gives a summary of the rules of Tichonius, and uses the passages examined by the latter, among which is that from Isaiah (14:12): "*Quomodo cecidisti de coelo, Lucifer, qui mane oriebaris*?" *Sententiarum* Lib. I, cap. xix. It is not insignificant, I think, that, in the

If, as I believe, the expression "primo aspetto" refers specifically to Lucifer, Dante is, I think, referring to him as the head of the whole body of the wicked, and at the same time to that whole body; just as, according to Tichonius and St. Augustine, a single sentence of the Scriptures may refer both to Christ the head of the church and to the whole assemblage of the elect, which is the body of Christ. Beatrice is denouncing the ravages of sin ("cupidigia") in the whole world; and just as it is impossible for her to neglect the very source of "cupidigia," the first example of it in the world, so it is impossible for her (especially now that she and Dante are in the *Primum Mobile*, where are none but angels) to neglect the angels and speak only of men. Men and angels are inseparable in their sin; as there are only two states of the rational creatures of God, so there is only one hierarchy:

. . . . demonstratur quantum a nobis potest, quam non inconueniens neque incongrua dicatur esse hominibus Angelisque societas: ut non quatuor, duae scilicet Angelorum totidemque hominum, sed duae potius civitates, hoc est societas, merito esse dicantur; una in bonis, altera in malis, non solum Angelis, verumetiam hominibus constitutae.¹

Quia igitur unus est Deus princeps non solum omnium angelorum, sed etiam hominum et totius creaturae; ideo non solum omnium angelorum, sed etiam totius rationalis creaturae, quae sacrorum particeps esse potest, una est hierarchia, secundum quod Augustinus dicit (*De Civitate Dei* Lib. XII, cap. i, circ. princ.) "duas esse civitates, hoc est societas, unam in angelis bonis, et hominibus, alteram in malis."²

If Dante had intended to refer only to the fall of Lucifer, we might expect him to have used a past tense, "così si fe' la pelle bianca nera," for example; but since he intends to include in his reference not only the head but also the whole "societas malorum"

Moralium of St. Gregory, the chapter before the one in which is magnified the pre-eminence of Lucifer over the other angels, contains the following comment on the passage from the Lamentations of Jeremiah: "Candidiores Nazarel ejus nive, nitidiores lacte, rubicundiores ebore antiquo, sapphiro pulchriores; denigrata est super carbones facies eorum, et non sunt cogniti in Plateis. . . . (Thren. IV, 7, 8): Denigrata est super carbones facies eorum. Nigri enim post candorem fiunt, quia amissa Dei iusticia cum de se praesumant, in ea etiam quae non intelligunt, peccata dilabuntur; et quia post amoris ignem ad frigus torporis veniunt, extinctis carbonibus ex comparatione praefertuntur." Lib. XXXII, cap. xxii. *Op. omni.* (ed. cit., Tom. II, No. 1070).

¹ *De Civitate Dei* Lib. XII, cap. i (ed. cit., Vol. III, p. 60).

² *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. CVIII, Art. I.

which is the body of the devil, he uses the present tense.¹ And if he had access to the text of Tichonius, which is by no means unlikely considering the fame of the work, he would find an example exactly fitted for his purpose, an example taken from Holy Scripture referring to the fall of Lucifer in the same comprehensive way, and using the present tense accordingly. For in the seventh rule of Tichonius "De diabolo et ejus corpore" occurs the following comment on Isaiah 14:16:

Qui viderint te mirabuntur super te et dicent: *Hic est homo qui concitat terram, commovet reges, qui ponit orbem terrae totum desertum . . . non enim dicent: Hic est homo qui incitavit terram, movit reges et posuit orbem totum desertum, sed Incitat et Commovet et Ponit.* Hominem enim totum corpus dicit tam in regibus quam in populis, cuius hominis superbi partem cum Deus percutit et ad inferos deiicit dicimus: *Hic est homo qui incitat terram, commovet reges, scilicet sanctos.*²

The sin of covetousness which was the undoing of Lucifer corrupted the whole hierarchy from top to bottom. From the first angel to the first man the disease spread rapidly. In heaven the pestilence was quickly eliminated because there God rules his subjects directly, but on earth where there is no direct ruler (in the absence of a heavenly appointed emperor) it is still reaping its harvest.³ For this reason Beatrice, in her speech beginning: "O cupidigia, che i mortali affonde," is speaking of covetousness among men, since the angels are now immune, but that she has not forgotten that men and angels belong to a single hierarchy, and that she is thinking also of the beginning of the whole disaster, is confirmed by the illustration she uses of the tree the blossoms of which fail to produce fruit:

Ben fiorisce negli uomini il volere:
Ma la pioggia continua converte
In bozzacchioni le susine vere.⁴

¹ It is probable that "così si fa" is the correct reading, since all the oldest MSS seem to have it.

² *Liber Regularum Tichonii* (ed. J. A. Robinson, Cambridge University Press, 1895), p. 75.

³ *Paradiso*, XXVII, 139-41: "Tu, perchè non ti facci meraviglia, Pensa che in terra non è chi governi: Onde si svia l'umana famiglia." St. Thomas in *Summa Theologica* I, Qu. CVIII, Art. I, after declaring that properly speaking there is only one hierarchy of men and angels, continues: "Sed si consideretur principatus ex parte multitudinis ordinatae sub principe, sic unus principatus dicitur secundum quod multitudo uno et eodem modo potest gubernationem principis recipere. . . . Et ideo oportet distingui humanam hierarchiam ab angelica."

⁴ *Paradiso*, XXVII, 124-26.

For in the *Convivio* Dante uses the same illustration for the corruption of the bad angels. There he is arguing that God's foreknowledge of the fall of some could not deter him from creating the angels, and he continues:

. . . che non sarebbe da lodare la Natura, se sapendo proprio che li fiori d'uno arbore in certa parte perdere si dovessero, non producesse in quello fiori, e per li vani abbandonasse la produzione delli fruttiferi.¹

So in the *Paradiso* where, speaking of Lucifer, he says:

il primo superbo,
Che fu la somma d'ogni creatura,
Per non aspettar lume, cadde acerbo.²

The words "cadde acerbo" ("fell unripe") represent the same metaphor.

I think that the obscurity of the lines "Così si fa," etc., is caused by the fact that, in the rest of her speech, Beatrice is speaking of the blighting effect of covetousness on earth. None of the interpreters looked here for a reference to covetousness in heaven, and to some the words "nel primo aspetto" seemed to refer to the early degeneracy of the individuals on earth, which had just been described in three consecutive "terzine." Such a reference, however, would not have been accurate, for although that degeneracy is said to appear early in the youth of those affected by the blighting influence, it is nevertheless not sudden; its rapidity is not to be compared with the suddenness of the fall of the first angel, less than twenty seconds after his creation:³ the "susine vere" are perverted into "bozzacchioni" by the steady rain, the "pioggia continua."⁴ And yet the blighting influence operates early on the youth of man, and I think the word "così" does refer to this precocity: "thus early,"

¹ *Convivio*, III, 12, ll. 76-81.

² *Paradiso*, XIX, 46-48.

³ *Ibid.*, XXIX, 49-51.

⁴ The metaphor of rain is used very frequently by Dante for celestial influence. The fallen angels inhabit the air, the "aer caliginosus," whence descends the rain. Petri Lombardi *Sententiarum* Lib. II, dist. vi, and Thomas Aquinas *Summa Theologica*, I, Qu. LXIV, Art. IV. The "pioggia continua," then, may mean the temptations of the devil, but since the rain at first favors vegetation, it may mean instead the continual instruction in religious matters which is unaccompanied by discipline. How this may be is explained by Gregory in his comment on Job 38:28: *Quis est pluviae pater?* etc., where occurs the following passage: "Terra enim cum compluitur, jactata in eam semina feracius ligantur. Sed rursum si illam pluvia immoderatus irrigat, in culmo pinguedinem frumenti virtutemque mutat"—*Moralium*, Lib. XXIX, cap. xxx (ed. cit., Tom. II, No. 945).

says Beatrice, "does the white skin turn black in the body of the devil," that is, in the society of the wicked, and the use of the designation "primo aspetto ecc." implies that the degenerate among mankind follow the example of the head of their body, who degenerated more rapidly than they do. Doubtless, too, the poet desired to make it clear that Beatrice is not accusing every single human being of corruption: not all youths learn to break the fasts of the church and to hate their mothers. The true members of the body of Christ are uncontaminated. It is the members of the body of the devil who are degenerate. And since he thought well to use some designation for that "societas malorum," the one he chose ("primo aspetto ecc.") was for many reasons the most appropriate, one of those reasons being that this expression designates the head as well as the body of the society of the wicked, the first and most rapid instance of prevarication. It was an opportunity to use effectively an expression such as those mentioned by Tichonius and Augustine, which indicate both the head and the body of the devil at the same time.

I anticipate that it will be said that this interpretation is not simple. All I can say in reply is that the meaning of this passage no doubt seemed simpler to the author than it does to us; that this interpretation is based not on a few stray sentences by obscure authors, but on whole bodies of doctrine in the writings of Augustine and Gregory, authorities for neglecting whom Dante blames the churchmen of his day,¹ and Aquinas, who is the poet's chief authority; that if the solution had been simple to a modern eye, it would long ago have been stated and universally accepted.²

That union between heaven and earth, which is contrived throughout the *Paradiso* by means of the interest that earthly affairs

¹ *Epist.* viii. 7. ll. 114-15.

² One of the simplest and best interpretations that have been offered is that of Parodi, according to which "la bella figlia" is the Dawn, daughter of the sun. "Così si fa nera la pelle, che si mostrava bianca al primo apparire di colei, ecc. cioè dell' Aurora. Ossia: così il cielo, di bianco ch'era al mattino, diventa nero la sera, . . ." (*B.S.D.*, XI, p. 193, n. 2.) But even if we admit that the sky ("il cielo") may properly be called the skin of the Dawn (not an easy admission), the sky only turns black at night, so that the skin of the Dawn would turn black only when the Dawn herself is completely absent. Also the order of the words in the original is an obstacle, for it is difficult to believe that "Così si fa la pelle bianca nera, nel primo aspetto ecc." means the same as: Così si fa nera la pelle, bianca nel primo aspetto ecc.

have for the saints, is especially noticeable in this twenty-seventh canto, as Fedele Romani observes.¹ But the unity of the worlds is emphasized by the contrast which is continually drawn between the earth and the heavenly spheres. The subject of that contrast is "cupidigia," the sin which was banished from heaven by the ruler enthroned in the Empyrean, as soon as it made its appearance, but in which the unhappy mortals on earth are still whelmed until the time when the promised earthly ruler shall appear.

At the beginning of the canto the poet is still in the eighth heaven, and the hymn raised by the spirits of the blessed to the Holy Trinity, together with the sight of what impresses him as a "riso dell' universo," draws from him the exclamation:

O gioia! O ineffabile allegrezza!
O vita intera d'amore e di pace!
O senza brama sicura ricchezza!²

Thus the central theme of "cupidigia" is introduced.

Then follows St. Peter's denunciation of covetousness in the church, the rulers of which are not true members of the body of Christ, but belong to the body of the devil. The body of God, it will be remembered, is "mixed," according to the expression of Tichonius; it is both "fusca et speciosa," "black" and "comely" in the English version of the Song of Solomon. St. Peter does not forget the celestial origin of covetousness:

. . . , onde il perverso,
Che cadde di quassù, laggiù si placa;³

but he concludes with a prophecy of the speedy interposition of Providence, referring obscurely to the coming of the "Veltro."

The saints soar triumphantly to the Empyrean, and as Dante follows them with straining eyes, Beatrice calls upon him to gaze below at the "sito di questa aiuola," the little but central earth, upon which he is able to see the place where Ulysses made his rash voyage, and that where Europa mounted the bull, typical instances of covetousness at work on earth.

Now Dante and Beatrice are wafted up into the Primum Mobile which, as she explains, is lodged in the heaven of light and love,

¹ *Lectura Dantis*, p. 55.

² Ll. 7-9.

³ Ll. 26-27.

and is the source of time and motion. And now begins the speech of Beatrice "O cupidigia" which, as Romani explains,¹ is the expression of the feelings aroused in her by the invective of St. Peter. But whereas the apostle has dealt only with covetousness in the church, she speaks of it as it appears in the whole body of the devil, the skin of which turns soon from black to white, just as it did even sooner in the head of that body. Like Peter she does not forget the origin of sin in the world, and like Peter she concludes with a prophecy of the coming of the "Veltro."

A minor motif in the theme of "cupidigia" is the rapidity with which it operates. In the last lines of the twenty-sixth canto Adam informs Dante that he fell from the state of innocence in six hours. Lucifer had fallen in less than twenty seconds. Among the children of men the process is slower, but still very rapid: with adolescence the blackening process is complete. The head turns black first and fastest; in the rest of the body, which is still growing—that is, in the number of the ill-predestined—the rapidity of the disease is somewhat delayed but still remarkable.

The comprehensiveness of the view of sin taken by Beatrice, which includes both its effects and its first cause, its qualities and its place in God's universe, is appropriate to her character as the Revealed Truth, which speaks sometimes clearly and sometimes obscurely, as do the Scriptures. It is characteristic too of Dante, as it was of Augustine, who always thought of evil as one of his two "civitates" which divide the whole world.

Of Augustine, Dante says, in that chapter of the *De Monarchia* in which he inveighs against the opponents of the Holy Empire, "quorum obstinata cupiditas lumen rationis extinxit, et dum ex patre diabolo sunt, Ecclesiae se filios esse dicunt".²

Sunt etiam scripturae Doctorum, Augustinii et aliorum, quos a Spiritu Sancto adiutos qui dubitat, fructus eorum vel omnino non vidit, vel si vidit minime degustavit.³

And to those who still find it strange to suppose that Beatrice (after describing the rapid perversion of mankind) is summing up

¹ *Lectura Dantis*, p. 46.

² *De Monarchia*, III, 3, ll. 45-48.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 87-91.

that description by including in it the head with the whole body of the "impiorum multitudo," when she says:

Così si fa la pelle bianca nera,
Nel primo aspetto della bella figlia
Di Quei ch'apporta mane e lascia sera,

I beg to recommend the words of Augustine already cited:

. . . non haesitemus quando a capite ad corpus, vel a corpore transitur ad caput, et tamen non receditur ab una eademque persona,¹

and also the chapters not hitherto mentioned, concerning the body of the devil, in the *De Genesi ad litteram*, from one of which the following extract is taken:

Quod ergo per Isaiam prophetam in eum dicitur: "Quomodo cecidit de coelo Lucifer mane oriens . . ." et caetera, quae in figura regis velut Babylonis in diabolum dicta intelliguntur, plura in ejus corpus conveniunt, quod etiam de humano genere congregat: et in eos maxime qui ei per superbiam cohaerent, apostatando a mandatis Dei. . . . Et iterum: "Sicut enim corpus unum est, et membra habet multa, omnia autem membra corporis cum sint multa, unum est corpus, ita et Christus" (I Cor. XII:12). Eo modo etiam corpus diaboli, cui caput est diabolus, id est ipsa impiorum multitudo, maximeque eorum, qui a Christo vel de Ecclesia sicut de coelo decidunt, dicitur diabolus, et in ipsum corpus figurate multa dicuntur, quae non tam capiti quam corpori membrisque conveniant. Itaque Lucifer qui mane oriebatur et cecidit, potest intelligi apostatarum genus vel a Christo, vel ab Ecclesia; quod ita convertitur ad tenebras, amissa luce, quam portabat, quemadmodum qui convertuntur ad Deum, a tenebris ad lucem transeunt, id est, qui fuerunt tenebrae lux fiunt.²

J. E. SHAW

TORONTO, CANADA

¹ *De Doctrina Christiana* Lib. III, cap. xxxi (ed. cit., Vol. V, pp. 37-38).

² *De Genesi ad litteram* Lib. XI, cap. xxiv (ed. cit., Vol. V, pp. 540-41); cf. also *ibid.*, cap. xxv, pp. 541-42.

THE MADRID MANUSCRIPT OF THE SPANISH GRAIL
FRAGMENTS. II¹

On f. 213 follows *La vida de los santos padres*.

Begins: Aqui comienza el libro que fabla de la mesquindat de la condicion humanal e fue conpuesto por uno que era diacono. E en este libro se contienen de los amonestamientos e de las vidas de los santos padres. Ay en el veynte e tres capitulos, aunque non estan aqui todos.

Pregunto uno al abat Antonio: "Que guardare para aplazer a Dios?" Rrespondio el viejo [e] dixo: "Guarda lo que te mando. Doquier que vayas, ave sienpre a Dios delante los tus ojos."

The story just quoted is taken from *De vitis Patrum liber quintus*,² sive *Verba seniorum*, auctore Graeco incerto, interprete Pelagio S.R.E. diacono, Migne, LXXIII, c. 851. The Latin text (c. 855) reads:

Interrogavit quidam abbatem Antonium ..., dicens: Quid custodiens placebo Deo? Et respondens senex dixit: Quae mando tibi, custodi. Quocunque vadis, Deum semper habe prae oculis tuis: et in his quae agis, adhibe testificationem sanctarum Scripturarum; et in quocunque loco sederis, non cito movearis. Haec tria custodi, et salvus eris.

I offer here an additional specimen of the Spanish text (f. 225):

¶ Era un hermitano en las partes mas baxas de Egipto, e este era muy nonbrado, que estava señero en aquel yermo. Segund la obra de Satanas puso en coraçon a una mala mugier desonesta que fuese a el. E ella fuese e dixolo a unos mançebos: "Que me daredes, e desporne aquel hermitano?" E posieron con ella de le dar una cosa sabida. E ella salio a la tarde e vyno a la çela del hermitano, como que andava errada, e ferio a la puerta. Salio el hermitano e quando la vyo, fue turbado e dixole: "Como veniste aca?" Dezia ella como llorando: "Ando errada e llegue aqui." E el con grand piedat metiola en el ** de la çela [f. 225 v] e cerro la puerta. Mas aquella malaventurada llorava e non quedava de llorar ¶ deziendo: "Abbat, las bestias me comeran aqui." E el conturboso [e] dezia: "Donde me vyno esta yra?" E abrio la puerta e mandola entrar dentro. E començo luego el diablo de aguyjonar el su coraçon con saetas en ella. E quando el entendio

¹ See *Modern Philology*, XVIII, 147-56.

² The *Liber quintus* has eighteen libelli.

que eran aguyjones del diablo, dezia: "Las carreras del diablo tenieblas son, mas del fijo de Dios claridat e luz de vida son." E levantose e encendio la candela e enflamado dezia: "Los que fazen tales cosas van a los tormentos. E prueva a ty mismo sy podras sofrir el fuego perdurable." E pusso el debdo mas pequeno en la candela, e ardia el dedo. Mas non lo sentia por el grand encendimiento de la codicia carnal. E faziendo asy fasta la mañana encendio todos los dedos. Mas aquella malaventurada veyendo lo que el fazia uvo muy grand miedo e tornose tal como piedra. ¶ E en la mañana venieron los mançebos que la avyan enbiada al monte, e llamaron a la puerta. Dixieron: "Vyno aca ayer tarde una tal mugier?" Dixo el ermitano: "Sy, ela do duerme." E entraron e fallaronla muerta. E descubriose el manto e mostroles las manos. Dixo: "Vet que me fizo esta fija del diablo, que me fizo perder todos mis dedos!" E conto todo el fecho, como fuera. Dezia en su coraçon: "Non es de rrendir mal por mal; que asy es escripto." E fizo a Dios oracion por ella. E rresucitola Dios por su rruego, e convertiose ella e vyvyo castramiente todo el tiempo de la su vida.

The Latin text (c. 883) reads:

Solitarius quidam erat in inferioribus Aegypti, et hic erat nominatissimus, quia solus in ecclesia sedebat in deserto loco. Et ecce, juxta operationem Satanae, mulier quaedam inhonesta audiens de eo, dicebat juvenibus: Quid mihi vultis dare, et depono istum solitarium vestrum? Illi autem constituerunt ei certum quid quod darent ei. Quae egressa vespere, venit velut errans ad cellam ejus; et cum pulsaret ad cellam, egressus est ille; et videns eam turbatus est, dicens: quomodo huc advenisti? Illa autem velut plorans, dicebat: Errando huc veni. Qui cum miseratione viscerum pulsaretur, introduxit eam in atriolum cellulae suae, et ipse intravit interius in cellam suam, et clausit. Et ecce infelix illa clamavit, dicens: Abba, ferae me comedent hic. Ille autem iterum turbatus est, timens etiam judicium Dei, dicebat: Unde mihi venit ira haec? Et aperiens ostium, introduxit eam intro. Coepit autem diabolus velut sagittis stimulare cor ejus in eam. Qui cum intellexisset diaboli esse stimulos, dicebat in semetipso: Viae inimici tenebrae sunt; Filius autem Dei lux est. . . . Surgens ergo accendit lucernam. Et cum inflammaretur desiderio, dicebat: Quoniam qui talia agunt, in tormentis vadunt. . . . Proba ergo teipsum ex hoc, si potes sustinere ignem aeternum. Et mittebat digitum suum in lucernam. Quem cum incendisset, et arderet, non sentiebat propter nimiam flammam concupiscentiae carnalis. Et ita usque mane faciens, incendit omnes digitos. Illa autem infelix videns quod faciebat, a timore velut lapis facta est. Et venientes juvenes mane ad monachum illum, dicebant: Venit hic mulier sero? Ille autem dixit: Etiam; ecce ubi dormit. Et intrantes invenerunt eam mortuam. Et dicunt: Abba, mortua est. Tunc ille recutiens palliolum suum, quo utebatur, ostendit eis manus suas, dicens: Ecce quod mihi fecit filia ista diaboli, perdidit omnes digitos meos. Et narrans eis quod factum

fuera, dicebat: Scriptum est, ne reddas malum pro malo. . . . Et faciens orationem, suscitavit eam. Quae conversa, caste egit residuum tempus vitae suae.

This is a very well-known story.¹ The scholars who have discussed it most recently are probably Menéndez Pidal, *Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott*, II (1911), 261, and Wendland, *De fabellis antiquis earumque ad christianos propagatione*, 1911, 15. Wendland refers to the study by Rabbow, *Die Legende des Martinian*, Wiener Studien, XVII (1895), 253.

The *Vida de los santos padres* ends on f. 237^v:

Un onbre sancto oyo que peccara uno e lloro amargosamiente. Dixo: "Tu oy e yo cras." .. "Enpero que alguno ante ti pecco, non² lo judgues. Mas judga a ti por mas peccador que a otro."

This story is from *De vitis Patrum liber septimus, sive Verba seniorum auctore Graeco incerto, interprete Paschasio S.R.E. diacono*, Migne, LXXIII, c. 1025. The Latin text (c. 1039) reads:

Unus ex sanctis Patribus videns alium negligentem, fleuit amare, dicens: Vae mihi, quia quomodo hodie iste peccat, sic et ego crastino. Et monebat discipulum suum, dicens: Quamvis aliquis graviter praesente te peccaverit, ne condemnes eum; sed sic apud te sit, tanquam tu plus eo pecces, quamvis ille saecularis sit, nisi forte Deum blasphemaverit, quod est haereticorum.

Beer, *Handschriftenschätze Spaniens*, notes the following Latin MSS of the *Vitae patrum*: pp. 124 Celanova—*Vitae Patrum de Graeco in Latinum translatae per Paschasium ad Martinum Presbyterum et Abbatem*—s. XIII³; 224 Eslonza—*Vitas Patrum*—1099; 252 San Juan de las Abadesas—1458; 361 Montes—915; 370 Oña—s. XII; 412 Ripoll—1046; 455 Silos—? ; 462 Sobrado—956; 541 Vega—950; 543 Vich—1457; 557 Viniagio—873. To these is to be added a MS formerly belonging to the Conde de Haro and now in the National Library. Paz y Mélia, *Rev. Arch. Bibl. Mus.*, I (1897), 66, gives the following description: Fol. 1.^o, 1.^a col. Continentur in hoc libro adhortationes sanctorum patrum ad profectum perfectionis monachorum. Tabla.—2.^a col.: Incipiunt adhortationes sanctorum

¹ Noted e.g. at least eight times in Herbert: 20, 66, 460, 468, 517, 563, 583, 656.

² MS. peqñō.

³ This number is either the date of the MS, or the date of its presentation to some convent, etc., or the date of the catalogue from which the MS is cited. The range of these dates indicates in general the popularity of the work.

patrum. Emp. Interrogavit quidam beatum Antonium dicens: . . .¹ Letra del siglo XIV. Vitela. [82] Hojas. . . . Other MSS of which we have no record probably existed. It is also likely that the work was translated early into Spanish as into French, English, German, and Italian. I find, however, no trace of a Spanish translation in MS. The first printed editions of which I know are those of Zaragoza [c. 1491] (Haebler, *Zentralbl. f. Bibl.*, XXVI, 155)², of Salamanca, 1498 (*Cat. Salvá*, II, 824=Haebler, *Bibliografía ibérica del siglo XV*, 157, No. 336), of Sevilla, 1538 (*Cat. Ticknor*, 406: a translation into "fine old Castilian"), and of Toledo, 1553 (*Cat. Ticknor*, 172).³

The great histories of Spanish literature are surprisingly silent on this subject. Ticknor, though he possessed the last two copies mentioned, nowhere in his History speaks of the *Vitae patrum*. The Spanish and the German translations of Ticknor are also silent. Rios (IV, 308) in discussing the sources of [Clemente Sanchez] *Libro de los Enxemplos*, among which, according to the author's own repeated statement, are *Las Vidas de los santos Padres*, misses a good chance to tell us something about the work. He lets a second opportunity pass by in VI, 45, where he deals with translations of such works as the *Legenda aurea* and the *Conlationes patrum*. Baist (414) mentions the *Vitae patrum* only in connection with Clemente Sanchez. Finally, the author of the *Orígenes de la Novela* gives (I, CIII) merely as one of the sources of the *Libro de exemplos* the *Vidas y colaciones de los Santos Padres*. I am afraid that he has merged here two different works into one: *Vitae patrum* and Johannis Cassiani *Conlationes* XXIII.⁴

¹ A French MS (*Hist. litt.*, XXXIII, 323) begins in a similar way: *Ci comencent les enhortemens des sains Peres e les perfections des moines lesquels sains Jeromes translata et mist de grec en latin. Uns hons demanda a l'abbé Antoine et dist: . . .*

² The translator was Gonzalo García de Santa María. The work is attributed to Saint Hieronymus. P. Meyer, *Hist. litt.*, XXXIII, 315: On mettait fréquemment sous le nom de saint Jérôme l'ensemble des écrits variés que l'on désignait par le titre vague de *Vitae* ou *Vitas patrum*.

By the way, neither the *Caton en latin y en romance*, of which Haebler speaks on page 154 of his article, nor the *Arte de bien morir*, bound together with the *Caton* and described by Haebler, *Bibl. ibér.*, 356, was discovered by P. Fernandez. It was I who first called the attention of P. Fernandez to these works. Cf. my *Notes on two Old Spanish Versions of the Disticha Catonis*, pp. 11-12.

³ Under Hieronymus.

⁴ For Cassianus in Spain, see Beer, 615; for Catalan translations, see also Morel-Fatio, Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 90, and Schiff, *La bibliothèque du marquis de Santillane*, 160; for Portuguese translations, C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos, Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 212.

On f. 237^v follows *El libro de Frey Johan de Rrocacisa*.

Begins: En el nonbre de Dios. Aqui comiença el libro que compuso Frey Juan de Rrocacisa, frayre de la orden de Sant Francisco, de las cosas maravillosas y¹ espantos que han de (venir e) acontecer² en los tienpos que han de [venir], el qual llamo: Buen amigo, non te partas de mi en el tienpo de la tribulacion. El comienço del qual es este que se sygue: A vos, Frey Pedro, maestro de fisica, de la orden de Sant Francisco, yo, Frey Juan, frayre sobredicho, de la misma orden, rrequerido por vos e rrogado³ que vos declarase e denunciase algunas cosas de los spantos e temores que han de venir çedo y en breve tienpo sobre todo el mundo, digovos e fagovos de cierto que. . . .

Ends on f. 251: El qual tratado e cada una cosa de quanto en el es, dize e fabla homildosamente so hemienda e correpcion del sancto padre e cardenales, patriarchas e arçobispos e obispos, e[n] enalçamiento de la sancta madre yglesia de Rroma e de la corte çelestial. Amen. Deo graçias.

The present text is a translation of Jean de la Roche-Taillée's⁴ *Vade mecum in tribulatione*, written in 1356⁵ and printed (only once) by Brown, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum*, II, Londini, 1690, 496.⁶

On the early acquaintance of the Iberian Peninsula with Jean de la Roche-Taillée, I may quote from Morel-Fatio (Gröber's *Grundr.*, II, II, 111): "Wie es scheint, beschäftigten sich die Könige Aragons im 14. und 15. Jh. hauptsächlich deshalb mit Astrologie, weil sie sich der Genauigkeit gewisser Weissagungen und Prophezeiungen vergewissern wollten, welche sog. Erleuchtete und Schwindler, wie der

¹ This form does not occur in the texts which I shall publish.

² MS *acontesçer*.

³ MS *rrogase*.

⁴ Thus I write the name with *L'Intermédiaire*, I, 205b. Other forms are Roche-taillade (Froissart [Kervyn de Lettenhove], Döllinger), Roche Tranchée (Ulstade-Brunet), Roquetaillade (Bayle, Chevalier, Wetzer-Welte, Buchberger). The ordinary Latin form is *Rupescissa* (Brown, Fabricius, Brunet, Graesse).

⁵ *Vade mecum*, 497.

⁶ The *Vade mecum* is preceded by the same author's *Prophetia* (494), written in 1349 and frequently printed since the beginning of the sixteenth century as a part of the *Mirabilis liber qui prophetias Reuelationesque nec non res mirandas preteritas presentes et futuras aperte demonstrat*. Together with the other Latin parts of the *Mirabilis liber*, the *Prophetia* has been translated into modern French and printed at Paris, 1831. Thus I glean from *Cat. Rothschild*, I, 119, whose compiler, however, is wrong in identifying the author of the *Prophetia* with "Jean de La Roche-Taillée ... cardinal (m. en 1437)" and crediting the latter with the authorship of *De consideratione quintae essentiae rerum*.

Franziskaner Johann von Roquetaillade, Lasa, Turmeda, Cervera u.a. veröffentlichten und in grosser Anzahl verbreiteten." A note to this statement reads: "Die Prophezeiungen von Rocatallada, Lasa und Turmeda, in katalanischer Sprache, sind in eine Hs. des 15. Jhs. der Bibliothek von Carpentras eingetragen (Lambert, l.c., I, 174).¹

The earliest references to Jean de la Roche-Taillée in Spanish literature as also the only ones I have, are these: *Del fuerte leon suso contenido dise el Merlin, concuerda fray Juan*, Villasandino, C. Baena, 176, and *Çesarán muchos profetas De Merlin et Rocaçisa*, Juan Alfonso de Baena, *Antología*, II, 261.

On f. 251-282 follows *Josep Abarimatia*.

On f. 282^v-296 follows *Merlin*.

On f. 296^v follow *Los articulos e fe de los cristianos*.

Begin: Titulo de la sancta fe e crehencia de los fieles cristianos. La santa fe de los cristianos es tener e creher firmamente los quatorze² articulos: VII. de la divinidat e siete de la humanidat. . . .

End on f. 298: E destos sacramentos los tres non se doblan e son: batismo, confirmacion, orden de clerigo. ¶ E los quatro se doblan: penitencia, cuerpo de Dios, extrema uncion, matrimonio.

I have not succeeded in finding anything on this text.

On f. 298^v-300^v follows *Lançarote*.

Josep Abarimatia, *Merlin*, and *Lançarote* will be published by me in a year or two.

K. PIETSCH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Lambert is not accessible to me. A Catalan translation of another of Jean de la Roche-Taillée's works is described by Morel-Fatio, *Cat. des mss. espagnols et des mss. portugais [de la Bibl. Nat.]*, 36 b.

² MS quatorzeze.

OLD SPANISH GIRGONÇA

In the *Libro de Buen Amor*, copla 1610 (ed. Ducamin), Juan Ruiz likens the *mujeres chicas* to small precious stones, and says:

En pequena girgonça yace grand resplandor.

Cejador, in his edition of the *Libro de Buen Amor*, has the following comment on *girgonça*: "piedra fina. Villena, Cis. 3: Asy como rubi e diamante e girgonça." The *Diccionario de Terreros* (II, 391) defines *girgonça* as "especie de piedra contra el veneno," and also quotes Villena. Zerolo has a similar explanation.

As will be noted, the definitions given are all vague and do not give any clear idea as to the identity of the stone. In reading Marie de France, *Le Fraisne*, it occurred to me that OSp *girgonça* might be traced to the OFr *jagonce*, which Warnke translates "rubin."¹ Concerning the latter word very copious material can be found in Pannier's *Les lapidaires français*, where the following forms are found: *jagonce*, *jagunce*, *jagonces*, *jacinte*, *jacincte*, *jacynthe*, supposedly derived from the Latin *hyacinthus* through the Greek *ῥάκινθος*. The gender varies. Schuchardt² discusses the word in detail and doubts the etymology suggested by one of A. Thomas' pupils: *hyacinthus* mixed with *Zakynthus*.³ He admits, however, the possibility of a contamination of *hyacinthus*, -ia, with OFr *jargon*, from Ital. *giargone* (compared in the *Dictionnaire Général* with OFr *jagonce*, *jargonce*). He traces the word from the Greek *ῥάκινθος* to the Syriac *yāquntā* (*yākundā*), and believes that the Syrians, who traded with France in Merovingian times, first brought the stone to the country. According to Schuchardt, it seems plausible that the OFr form was derived from the Syriac.

Godefroy, in addition to the forms already mentioned, has the following: *jargunces*, *jacunces*, *jagonses*, *jagonce*. The English word

¹ Karl Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France* (Halle, 1900), p. 59.

² *Zeits. für rom. Phil.*, XXVI, 398, 589, and XXVIII, 146. The following forms are quoted: MHG *idchant*, *idchant*, Russ. ЯХОУТЪ, Arab. *yāqūt*, Mod. Pers. *yākand*, Old Armen. *yakunf*, Georg. *iagunda*.

³ Modern Zante: Old Greek *Zakynthos*, the island opposite the bay of Corinth; cf. also *Saguntum*, now Murviedro in Spain, said to have been founded by Greeks from *Zakynthos*.

jargon, or *jargoon*, is defined in Murray's *New English Dictionary* as "a translucent, colourless or smoky variety of the mineral *zircon*, a silicate of *zirconia*, found in Ceylon." Murray also refers to the Ptg. *zarcão*, Arab. *zargûn*, from the Persian *zar-gûn* = gold-colored.

The *Lapidaire de Marbode* mentions three varieties:

L'une est granate, altre citrine,
L'autre evage,

and according to their color they have different magic properties:

Tutes confortent par vigur,
Vains penses toilent e tristur.

The best of all is claimed to be the bright red one, called the *jagonce grenas* (also *sarde*, *jagonce granas de sarde*, *jagonce balais*). As to the various magic or protecting qualities of this stone, compare Pannier's work (pp. 79, 125, 242, 280, 292).

Professor K. Pietsch called my attention to the *Lapidario de Alfonso el Sabio*, compiled in 1250, and to Don Juan Manuel's *El libro del Cavallero et del Escudero*,¹ written about 1326. In the first, three varieties of *iargonça* are mentioned: *vermeia*, *amariella*, and *blanca*, and their magic properties are described at length. The second mentions the word in the following passage: "las preciosas [i.e., piedras] son asi commo carbunculos et Rubis et diamantes et esmeraldas et balaxes et prasma et çaphires et çardeñas et *gironzas* et estopazas et aljofares et torquesas et calçadonias et cristales et otras piedras que fallan en las animalias." The *Lapidario* also mentions *yacoth*, of which it says: "De la tercera faz del signo cancro: es la piedra que a nombre en arauigo *yacoth alaazfor* et en latin *iargonça amariella* et algunos le dixieron otrosi *safir chitrino*."

To sum up:

1. *Girgonça* (*iargonça*) belongs to the group of precious stones which are silicates of *zirconia* (also spelled *circonia*, *jargonja*), and are of various colors, mostly white, yellow, and red, the last variety being considered the best of all and generally called *hyacinth* or *jacinth*. The variety known as *jargon* (*jargoon*) is of yellow, green, or brown color, but never red.²

¹ *Romanische Forschungen*, VII, 513.

² Cf. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. Meyer's *Konversations Lexikon*: "Ist farblos, selten weiss und wasserhell, meist hyazinthrot (hyacinth) oder bräunlich, auch gelb oder grün, glasglänzend. Die hyazinthroten Varietäten sind geschätzte Edelsteine; die blassgelben und farblosen, auch die künstlich durch Erhitzen entfärbten kommen als Maturadiamanten oder Jargon de Ceylan in den Handel."

2. It was probably first imported from the East, though it is also found in the alluvial sands in the Ural, in Norway, in Bohemia, in France, in Italy, in Australia, and in the United States.¹ In Pannier's work (p. 280), the country of its origin is mentioned three times:

Que on entre deus mers la trueve,
En l'isle qui a non Chorynthe²
La est apelée jacynte.
A coulor de ruby retrait ...
Pres d'Ethyope est cele terre
Ou on vait cele pierre querre.

3. It is the same variety of stone as the OFr *jagonce*, and has the same protective qualities. In the lay of *Le Fraïse* (ll. 127 ff.) the ring containing the stone is to protect a child from harm:

A une piece d'un suen laz
un gros anel li lie al braz.
De fin or i aveit une unce;
el chastun out une jagunce;
la verge entur esteit letree.

The *Lapidaire de Berne* says (p. 126):

En jacinete ha riche juiel,
Bien est digne d'estre en anel
Quar cil qui le porte sor soi
Pendue au col ou en son doi
Seürs puet estre, ce m'est vis,
Par la terre et par le país:
Pestilance et corrupcion
Ne autre tribulacion
Ne li nuist por terre changier
Ne por son país estrangier.

According to the *Lapidario*, 96 v.:

Et su uertud es atal que el que la troxiere consigo sera bien andant en mar: et en çaça de bestias.

The *Dictionnaire Infernal* of J. Collin de Plancy (p. 279) says of the *hyacinthe*: "pierre précieuse que l'on pendait au cou pour se

¹ Cf. *New International Encyclopedia*, article "Zircon." The etymology given there is as follows: From Arab. *zarkûn* (cinnabar, vermillion), Pers. *zargûn* (golden, yellow, from: *zar*, Skrt. *hirānya*=gold, and *gân*, Avestan *gaona*=color).

² Here possibly an allusion is made to Zante (Zakynthos), opposite the Bay of Corinth, formerly a considerable trade center for jewels.

défendre de la peste. De plus elle fortifiait le coeur, garantissait de la foudre, et augmentait les richesses et les honneurs."

4. It is *not* a "ruby," as Warnke and others translate it.¹ It will be noted that all the references quoted make a clear distinction between *jagonce*, *iargonça* and the ruby, which the *Lapidario* calls *robi*. The archpriest mentions ruby as evidently a different stone, in copla 1613: "*Como rroby pequenno tyene mucha bondad.*"

5. The etymology of the French and Spanish word is rather to be sought in the Greek *ῥάκινθος*, possibly through the Syrian variant *yāquntā* and contamination with *giargone*, as Schuchardt suggests, than in the Arab. *zargān* and Pers. *zargūn*. It seems probable that the stone became more widely known in Europe after the Crusades.

6. The OFr word being mentioned in the *Chanson de Roland* (ca. 1110) and in Marie's *Lais* (ca. 1160), it seems to be older than the Spanish *iargonça*, the earliest instance of which appears to be the *Lapidario* (1250). It would, therefore, seem plausible to assume that it passed from French into Spanish.

What color had the archpriest in mind? In another passage (copla 1387) he speaks of a shining *çafir* being found by a cock, and inasmuch as the yellow variety of *iargonça* was also called *safr chitrino* it may be that he means the same stone. From the attribute "grand rresplendor" we might infer that he means the white, diamond-like variety. Personally I am inclined to think that he means the bright red one, first, because he likens it to *mujeres chicas*, whose red cheeks and lips he likes so well, and second, because this variety was considered to be the most precious of all *girgonças*.

ALOIS RICHARD NYKL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Eugene Mason in his translation of *Le Fraigne* (*French Medieval Romances*, p. 93) uses the more nearly correct term "garnet." With regard to Arab. *yāqūt* and Mod. Pers. *yāqand*, Professor Sprengling informs me that it may at times very well be ruby, red sapphire, etc. (In the *aljamiado* texts, *al-yaquta* is used to designate this variety of stone.) He believes that the Arabic word is derived from the Persian, and the latter may well be derived from the Aramaic (resp. Syriac).

THE NEW MANUSCRIPT OF *ILLE ET GALERON*

The poem of *Ille et Galeron* by Gautier d'Arras has been known only from the very defective Paris manuscript (*fonds français*, 373). In 1911, Mr. W. H. Stevenson made a report to the British Manuscripts Commission upon the manuscript treasures found at Wollaton Hall and quoted liberally from the prologue and epilogue of a new text of the poem.¹ A brief notice of this discovery was made in an obscure corner of *Romania*, in 1913 (XLII, 145). So far as I know, the only other mention of this find is in Professor Sheldon's article, "On the Date of *Ille et Galeron*," *Modern Philology*, XVII, 1919.² Through the kindness of Lord and Lady Middleton and Mr. Stevenson, I have been fortunate enough to secure a rotograph of the new text. A comparison of this with the Paris manuscript shows interesting and important differences. I shall here briefly indicate these differences and shall also discuss the conclusions reached by Professor Sheldon.

Mr. Stevenson states that the new manuscript is in an early thirteenth-century French hand and in the Picard dialect. A careful examination of the new text indicates that it is in the hand of at least two scribes. The past participles of the first conjugation end in *-t*, as do nouns like *gret*. The Picard features differ as between the earlier and later folios of the text and certain Anglo-Norman features have been introduced. The only indication of the history of the volume is the name "John' Bertrem, de Thorp Kilton" (County York) in a fifteenth-century hand (*fo.* 347v). The text is in two columns of forty-seven or forty-eight verses each. It contains illuminated initials and seven miniatures in colors.³ Practically

¹ Report on the Manuscripts of Lord Middleton, preserved at Wollaton Hall, Nottinghamshire, Hereford, 1911, pp. 221 f.

² Since this was written Brandin's edition of the *Chanson d'Aspremont* ("Classiques français du moyen-âge," Vol. XIX), which is made from the Wollaton manuscript, has come to my attention.

³ 157r. Lamb with banner of Cross; 158r. Boy Ille with dragon; 160r. Rogelyon in armor on horseback; 164r. Ille and the Roman emperor; 170r. Ille and Ganor; 175r. Ille and the emperor again; 185r. Ganor. It is interesting to note that neither Duke Conain nor his sister Galeron are pictured, while Ganor and her father appear twice. The illustrator, at least, was more interested in the Roman part of the romance than he was in the Breton.

all of the text is legible. A few letters are blurred here and there, but almost all can be restored with the aid of the Paris manuscript. Two words are frequently written as one. The scribe used damaged parchment in several instances, for one page which bears stitches and several with holes show the text intact, written around the damaged spots.

The poem contains 5,835 verses, 757 less than the Paris manuscript. This is the net loss, for 1,182 lines of the Paris manuscript are missing, while there are 425 new lines. Necessarily there are important differences. The losses of lines are mainly in the prologue, in Ille's earlier battles, and in the account of the courtship of Ille and Galeron. The chief additions are in the kidnaping and rescue of Ganor, and in the epilogue. There are innumerable minor changes of letter, word, or word-order, almost all of which clear up controverted points. The larger part of Foerster's notes are now obsolete. In many cases, Löseth's emendations are justified by the new text.

The rhymes are generally exact. Identical rhymes and two couplets on the same rhyme syllable are more frequent than in the Paris manuscript. There is but one lacuna, the rhyme pair to verse 1255 (after 1938, Paris) being lacking. The verse does not occur in the Paris manuscript, and it very clearly does not belong where it stands.¹

Seventy-three lines of the old prologue are missing. The allusions to Germany are lacking and the eulogy of Beatrice is reduced in other ways.² Of the 13 new lines, one fills the lacuna after 117,³ two are added to the discussion of Envy,⁴ and after 131 are added the ten following:

W. 63 Molt par me torne a grant anui
Quant ainc ma dame ne conui;
65 Molt me fust encor plus soëf.
Or m'estuet sigler a plain tref
Por çals ataindre qui ains murent
Et qui ainc (*l. ains*) de moi le conurent.
Tols les premiers volrai ataindre;

¹ P(aris) 1255 "Icil i vint molt erramment."

² P. 8-19, 23-54, 79-102, 107-10, and 132.

³ P. 46 "Tant come honors loe et conselle."

⁴ W(ollaton) 57 "Li drois d'envie est une ardors
Qui li fait haïr les mellors."

70 Car molt a entre faire et faindre.
 Servir le voel si com jo sai;
 Car a s'onor voel faire .i. lai
 De Galeron, etc.

These lines might well be taken into consideration in connection with any argument regarding the date of the poem. Does Gautier mean that he did not know Beatrice until after the coronation at Rome, and that he wishes to enjoy as much of the new Empress' favor as those who had known her before she had risen to her full height of fame? This would seem to favor, for the beginning of the poem, a date somewhere near August 1, 1167.

Line 72, if it is Gautier's, is very important, for in it the poem itself is referred to as a "lai." Unfortunately we cannot compare it with the famous passage (P. 929-36) criticizing *lais*, for that passage does not occur in this version. If this passage belongs in the original manuscript, it clearly does not refer to any possible source in a *lai d'Ille et de Galeron*: the *lais* which Gautier is criticizing are those of Marie de France, which were probably then enjoying great popularity in the French courts.

In the description of the first battle fought by Ille against Hoël, his traditional enemy, when Ille returns from exile in France (P. 277-546), we find many lines in changed order. While 20 new lines appear, 291 are missing, including all the plays on the numbers of knights and those where the French knights show a certain nervousness (P. 447-63). The 100 lines recounting the exploits of Bruns d'Orleans and Estout de Langres (P. 578-677) are absent, and the rôle of Hoël is greatly abbreviated.

In the episode of the battle with Rogelyon, the rejected suitor and nephew of Hoël, 62 lines are missing, while 9 are added.

In the courtship of Ille and Galeron 185 lines are dropped, 13 added. The monologues of the two lovers are entirely omitted, as is the pretty scene in which Conain drags from his sister the confession of her feelings. In this more primitive version, Conain offers Galeron to Ille, and, when the offer is accepted, goes and tells the girl to get ready at once for the wedding. We are here closer to the spirit of the *chanson de geste* than to that of the courtly epic. The faulty connection at this point indicates, however, that

at least some of the lines in the Paris manuscript belonged in the original.

The important episode in which Ille lost an eye is quite different. The 32 lines (P. 1625-56) which tell of his triumph in the tournament and his unlucky decision to try just one more tilt are missing and in their place are the six following:

W. 981 Un jor estoit en une guerre;
Si prist le segnor de la terre
Devant le castiel qu'il avoit.
Mais uns de çals que il tenoit
Al rembarer la forteresce
Retorne al pont et si s'adrece.
De la lance qu'il porte en destre
Fiert Ylle, etc.

This decided difference between the two versions suggests the possibility that Gautier himself made two versions of his poem, one for Beatrice and another for Thibaut. The absence of the tournament scene from the Wollaton manuscript recalls the opposition to this form of sport. It had been forbidden by a papal decree of 1131, renewed in 1139,¹ participants were threatened with excommunication, and ecclesiastical burial was to be denied anyone who might be killed.

The episode in which the wounded Ille slips away to a castle so as not to see his wife, and she succeeds in getting into his presence, is much improved by the insertion of the following lines after P. 1754:

1069 A bien petit que ne se tue;
D'uns dras a home s'est vestue.

In the catalogue of countries visited by Galeron in further pursuit of her elusive husband, there are some marked changes. In verse 1295 (P. 1988) Bresaliande replaces Nohuberlande; in 1297 (P. 1990) Auvergne is replaced by Norouerge and Normendie is added; in 1301 (P. 1994) Esclavonie is replaced by Bougerie; and two new lines (1306-7) after P. 1998 bring in Borgoigne.

In Ille's first battle for the Roman emperor against the Greeks there are only minor changes; 33 lines are added, 23 subtracted.

¹ Young Henry of Champagne and the king's brother Robert held a great tournament at Easter, 1149, in spite of the very vigorous efforts of St. Bernard to have the Abbé Suger, regent of France, Count Thibaut (father of Henry and our patron Thibaut), and other notables forbid it. See Arbois de Jubainville, *Histoire des ducs et des comtes de Champagne*, III, 21-24.

The second battle, in which the seneschal is killed, is substantially the same in both versions. In the third battle, where Ille commands as acting seneschal, the differences are more numerous, though of little importance: 135 lines are dropped, 16 added.

After P. 3504, the following new lines add clearness to the emperor's offer:

2674 Ma fille aura a son deport
Et tolt l'empire apriés ma mort.

The next important changes are in the scene in which the messengers report their vain search for Galeron. The Wollaton manuscript omits the entire speech in which Ille laments his loss (3897-3938), as well as the 26 lines in which is related Ganor's eagerness for a speedy wedding (3956-79). In the account of the festivities on the eve of the wedding, one adds to the list of quotations attesting the popularity of the Breton *lais*:

3094 (P. 3984) Cil jogleör harpent et notent,
Vièlent et cantent et rotent
Ces lais bretons entros qu'en son.

In the scene at the church door, the Wollaton manuscript omits the 31 lines (P. 4225-55) in which Galeron expatiates upon the prayers she will offer for Ille if he will place her in a convent, and substitutes for them five of a more worldly and realistic type:

3344 "Se tos li mondes ert a moi
Ne me valroit il rien sans toi
Ne me poroie joie atendre."
Cil le voit bele et blance et tendre
Et voit le cors bien fait et gent.
Ja le baisast devant la gent (P. 4256).

In the account of Ille's second visit to Italy, several scenes are amplified. The messenger who informs him of the abduction of Ganor gives him directions as to the best means of waylaying the abductors. The attack and the rescue are described in greater detail, 60 new lines appearing. Twenty-eight additional lines by way of summary, and 28 in further description of the joy of the newly wedded pair and their court, mark the remaining important additions to the body of the poem. The 30 new lines of prologue will be mentioned in connection with Professor Sheldon's article.

In his interesting and illuminating discussion, Professor Sheldon attacks the generally accepted dating of *Ille*. He criticizes Foerster's statement that the poem must have been composed shortly after the Roman coronation, August 1, 1167, mentioned in verse 69,¹ and pleads for a later date. He considers that the critics who have given 1167 or 1168 as the date of the poem have failed to prove their point. I agree with him that the only points absolutely fixed are 1164 as the earliest date for *Eracle*, 1167 the earliest for *Ille*, 1191 the latest for *Eracle*, and 1184 the latest for *Ille*; but I do not quite follow his argument for a later date for *Ille*. He says first (p. 385) that the poet's reference in the prologue to the coronation does not preclude a much later date than 1167, as the coronation was important enough to be mentioned at any time; second, that it is doubtful if Gautier would have written his prologue, or retained it if written, while the Empress was in Italy or during the flight from Rome, because she would not have been in a receptive mood for the poet's offering then or for some years after, perhaps not till 1174, or even until after 1178. Professor Sheldon himself is not fully satisfied with the validity of this argument, for he says (p. 391):

The tantalizing lines 9*-18*, with what may have immediately preceded them, seem to allude to something that caused an absence which led him to consider another patron, though he had not lost hope of some recognition from the Empress.² Did he perhaps begin his poem while the Empress was in Italy, hoping for her return before or soon after its completion, and then because this return was delayed (in which case we should naturally think of her stay of nearly four years in Italy, 1174-78), or because he had some other reason, whatever it was, did he finish with praise of the count as well as of her? Whatever had happened, it looks as if a fairly long interval elapsed between beginning and end.

This latter point of view (except for the dates 1174-78) seems to me the more nearly correct. The poet was about to compose his work in honor of the new Empress. He was determined to win as much favor as those poets who had known her longer, but, for some reason, in his epilogue he changed his dedication to another patron, Thibaut, whom he applauded as her equal. Was not this action eminently appropriate to the black days after the coronation and

¹ W. 25, "Rome le vit ja coroner."

² The lines are less obscure if 7* and 8* are placed before 5*, according to a suggestion made by Professor T. A. Jenkins.

the flight from Italy? If Beatrice had been in a mood for generosity, the poet would have had no reason to seek another patron. But, as Professor Sheldon himself says, there is nothing conclusive about any of this argument. There is, however, a possibility of narrowing down somewhat the question of the date. Professor Sheldon is convinced from verses 6592-1*:

W. 5805 Galters d'Arras qui s'entremist
D'Eracle ains qu'il fesis cest uevre,

that *Eracle* was written before *Ille*. I think that the definitions of the verb *s'entremetre* given in Godefroy will bear me out in my claim that the only thing proved by these lines is that Gautier began *Eracle* first. The text of *Eracle* bears the marks of having been written in three different parts, of which at least one was written after *Ille*. This opinion is strengthened by evidence in the Wollaton manuscript. The argument for the conclusion that *Ille* was finished before *Eracle* may be briefly stated as follows:

For *Eracle* there were three patrons or three phases of patronage: (1) Thibaut V of Blois, alone mentioned in the prologue; (2) Thibaut and Marie of Champagne, his sister-in-law, mentioned at the beginning of the epilogue; (3) Baudouin of Hainaut, mentioned in the epilogue as cause of the poem's completion and the person to whom it was being sent.

For *Ille* there are two patrons: (1) Beatrice of Burgundy, Empress of Germany, alone mentioned in the prologue; (2) Beatrice and Thibaut, mentioned in the epilogue, the former as the cause of the beginning of the work, the latter as the cause of its completion.

If we accepted the theory that *Eracle* was completed before *Ille*, we should be obliged to take with it not only the conclusion that Gautier broke off with Thibaut and Marie, and finished *Eracle* for Baudouin, but also that he thereupon began a work for Beatrice, deserted her, and returned to his former patron Thibaut. Is this probable? I am convinced that *Ille* must have been completed during the period when Gautier was working for the Champagne-Blois group and before he attached himself to Baudouin, consequently that *Ille*, while begun later than *Eracle*, was completed before it.

We are now confronted with the question as to whether the last patron is Baudouin IV or Baudouin V: if the former, both poems

must be placed before 1171, the year of his death. That would allow a margin of four years from 1167, the year of the coronation, when Thibaut's interest in *Ille* had not yet been sought. The closer *Eracle* is placed to the later date, the farther may *Ille* be removed from 1167, but at the extreme outside it could hardly be later than 1170. In case Baudouin V is the patron, the problem is no nearer settlement than before, 1184 for *Ille* and 1191 for *Eracle* being the limits.

Foerster preferred Baudouin IV, considering Baudouin V as too young.¹ Professor Sheldon states that this choice "is of doubtful correctness," but does not give his reasons. I hope I have shown that his whole plea for a later date for *Ille* depends upon that choice being incorrect. In my own investigation of the subject, I have preferred Baudouin V, largely for the reasons that he was known as a patron of letters, while his father was not; that he was brother-in-law of that well-known literary patron, Philip of Flanders; and that he was in decidedly close relations with the courts of Champagne, Blois, and France. But the whole matter still rests upon too slender a basis of evidence to be at all satisfactory.²

FREDERICK A. G. COWPER

TRINITY COLLEGE
DURHAM, N.C.

¹ *Ille und Galerón von Walter von Arras*, herausgegeben von Wendelin Foerster, Halle, 1891, pp. xv-xvi.

² The following errors occur in the report of the British Manuscripts Commission and were reproduced by Professor Sheldon in his paper:

Page 388, verse 3. *com*, manuscript *con. pens*, no note necessary, MS reads *pens*. "Our poem begins on folio 158 recto, etc." It actually begins on folio 157 recto and ends on folio 187 verso.

Page 389. P. 6579 (W. 5790) *a non*. MS *anor*.

Page 390. 6* *En vie*, MS *Envie*. 18* *me*, MS *m = m'en*. 11*, 15*, and 22* MS reads *q = que*.

Page 391. 25* MS reads *liu*.

Por and never *pur* is found in the manuscript wherever unabbreviated. *M't* is never written out, but is found once in rhyme with *tolt*, i.e., *tout*.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

French Civilization from Its Origins to the Close of the Middle Ages.

By A. L. GUÉRARD. T. Fisher Unwin, 1920. Pp. 328.

Italian Social Customs in the Sixteenth Century and Their Influence on the Literatures of Europe. By T. F. CRANE. Yale Press, 1920. Pp. xv+689.

French Classicism. By C. H. C. WRIGHT. Harvard University Press, 1920. Pp. viii+177.

Synthetic history is in the air, and each of these three books offers the reader a summary of a cultural movement connected with France. The first and the third, as their titles show, deal with the two high points in French civilization: the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century. Both of them treat civilization as a background for literature, although it is perhaps in the nature of the case that Mr. Guérard's concern is chiefly with the background and Mr. Wright's with the literature. The second treatise deals, according to its title, not with France but with Italy. At the same time, the Italian social customs described had their origin in medieval France and attained their fruition, as Mr. Crane convincingly proves, in the age of Louis XIV (see also the same author's *La Société française au dix-septième siècle*). We need not be reminded that the French spirit is pre-eminently "social," and that social games or customs have a direct bearing on French literature. Ideally, then, the three volumes interlock, since the subject-matter of the second furnishes a convenient link between the French Middle Ages and French Classicism.

Of the three, Mr. Guérard's book is the most ambitious and, incidentally, also the least satisfactory. Writing under the impact of modern sociology, Mr Guérard makes a fitting distinction between civilization and culture: "The essential element in civilization is *usefulness* [the control over implements]; in culture, *consciousness* [the control over self]." The two terms necessarily overlap, but they are not coextensive. "A man enjoying without a thought the benefits of society is but a barbarian in modern clothing." On the other hand, "the sage whose needs are few, whose practical knowledge is scant, but whose mind is capable of embracing a vast purpose, is cultured in the highest sense of the term." Thus culture is the dynamics of civilization; it is the synthetic, social force, which being made conscious in a nation gives that nation unity and direction of expression. Mr. Guérard is correct in insisting on the cultural rôle of the French,

while admitting, with unusual breadth of spirit, that if we speak of a French civilization this is "nought but Western [European] civilization refracted through the French *milieu*." It is this *milieu* during the Middle Ages that he would reconstruct for us.

His treatise has two parts: Part I on the Origins (pp. 1-131) and Part II on the Middle Ages proper (pp. 133-309). The student of literature and the general reader, for whom Mr. Guérard affirms he is writing, naturally look to Part I for a treatment of such topics as the topography of France, the Celtic inhabitants of France, the Roman occupation, the Germanic invasions, and the establishment of the empire of the Franks, as all of these topics are essential to an understanding of the background upon which medieval culture rests. Not content, however, with regarding these matters as subsidiary, Mr. Guérard tends to exalt their importance and further confuses the reader by delving into the eolithic, paleolithic, and neolithic pre-history of man. Let us admit that the French are venerable, but culturally little is gained by the assertion that "the history of French civilization may be said to begin a thousand centuries ago, more or less" (p. 60). As a matter of fact, French civilization as such began when Gaul, Roman, and Teuton were sufficiently welded to constitute a new social order, and as far as we can ascertain, this was not before the ninth century. It is interesting, for example, to know that the prehistoric Crô-Magnon race, vestiges of which have been found in Dordogne, was presumably of a type similar to "a group of French peasants" at present inhabiting the same region, but the effect of such remote facts on Mr. Guérard's argument is to deprive it of concentration: the author dwells too long on preliminaries, some of them speculative in the extreme, and thus delays unnecessarily the treatment of his main subject.

The result is that the book as a whole lacks proportion; Part II, in particular, gives insufficient space to literary problems. Under the heading "Christian Culture" (p. 187), only two and a half pages are given to "Mediaeval Latin," a page and a half to "Sermons in Latin and French," and a scant five pages to the "Lives of Saints," the "Miracles of Notre Dame," and the "Drama." Or, if we look for an account of the Old French epic, we find it following an account of Villehardouin (whose work of course presupposes the epic) in a chapter upon the "Life of the Fighting Caste," of which it occupies six pages out of a total fourteen. The sole literary topic to have a chapter to itself is the "Romance of Chivalry" (p. 232), yet this chapter includes, under the separate caption of "Aristocratic Literature," Charles of Orléans (a writer of lyrics), Joinville and Froissart (who are really historians), and the briefest possible mention of *Aucassin et Nicolette* and of *Petit Jehan de Saintré*. Nowhere is there an adequate chronological record of the literary monuments emerging from their environment into the classic medieval forms of epic, romance, *lai*, *fabliau*, and allegory, to say nothing of the *rondeau*, *ballade*, and *épître*. While it is

true that Mr. Guérard's emphasis is on the social background, he is, to use his own words, "providing that background for the study of literature," and where, we may ask, is there a richer source for this purpose than in the literary documents themselves?

As for matters of detail, there is space here to mention but a random few. The Ligurians, rather than the Iberians (p. 69), it appears, were the first ascertainable inhabitants of all Gaul. On the religion of the Gauls, Mr. Guérard is wisely cautious; but it is known that originally Druidism was not Gallic but Goedelic: Lucan, *Pharsalia* I, 454, mentions the *alius orbis*, identical with the Irish *mag meld* (Plain of Delight), to which the deceased Gauls were believed to go. The Gallic divinity Sirona (p. 77) is more likely *Divonā*, since Ausonius speaks of her as:

Divona Celtarum lingua fons addite divis.

Most historians agree that the invading Franks were not numerous (p. 127): that they were "a mere handful" is however putting the case too strongly. Mr. Guérard might have dwelt advantageously on the extent to which the Teutons enriched the Gallo-Roman vocabulary. While granting that the Germanic *comitatus* appears the determining factor, his fairness in dealing with the origin of feudalism would have gained by adding that the word *beneficium* was taken from Roman law. The half-page (p. 163) given to the Order of Cluny is scarcely sufficient in view of the cultural importance of this order in promoting the pilgrimages to Spain (see Bédier, *Légendes*, III, 90 ff.) and thus inspiring the *chansons de geste*. With respect to the latter, it is, to say the least, misleading to speak of the *Chanson de Roland* as having "little literary charm," or to maintain (p. 231) that "classical stories and legends were retold in the prevailing form of the *Chansons de Geste*." This is partly true only of the *Alexander*, the third form of which is in twelve-syllable verse. A glance at any good handbook reveals the fact that the pseudo-classical romance, as such, is a product of *courtois*, as distinguished from Christian feudal society, and that the *Romance of Eneas* is certainly earlier than 1175 (p. 231). As for that other *courtois* product, the Arthurian romance, Geoffrey of Monmouth was not an Anglo-Norman but a Welsh cleric (p. 235); Chrétien of Troyes, not "the average sensual man with a talent for polite literature," but a story-teller of distinction, an astute psychologist, whose best pages Gaston Paris compares "aux plus célèbres monologues de nos tragédies, aux pages les plus fouillées de nos romans contemporains." Chrétien's grail is never "a vase" (p. 239) but a dish or platter; we are not certain that Robert de Boron hailed from Franche-Comté, and that he ever wrote a "trilogy" is an unsubstantiated hypothesis and not a known fact.

On the other hand, if Mr. Guérard's work lacks proportion and occasional accuracy of detail, it is well written, entertaining, and above all stimulating. The political and institutional features of the book are among its best. The

directing influence of the medieval church is ably depicted, just as it is clearly shown how with the rise of bourgeois (urban) culture the Catholic commonwealth disintegrates and the modern, nationalistic state takes its place—a change with which Mr. Guérard is not altogether pleased. "The feudal conception of property as a trust," he thinks, "is more acceptable to many progressive minds than the eighteenth-century doctrine of property as an abstract, unlimited right." It is such an admirable *échappée* as this that makes one regret doubly that Mr. Guérard's book is not more thoroughgoing.

By way of contrast, Mr. Crane's *Social Customs* is nothing if not thorough. His 689 pages take a social device—that of polite debate through question and answer—and trace it from the Old Provençal *partimen* or *joc-partit* down to the various "conversations" and *jeux de société* of the late Renaissance. As is to be expected from this veteran scholar, the method and execution of his work are alike sound, and the wealth of bibliographical detail is extraordinary. One might object that Mr. Crane takes little for granted: he tends to give us the entire *apparatus criticus* rather than the main argument capped with conclusions; Mr. Crane's style is not swift, and most readers of the volume could spare the account of the lives of Boccaccio, Leon Battista Alberti, and Marguerite d'Angoulême. By a singular slip Mr. Crane alludes to Philippe de Novaire (Novara) as "Philippe de Navarre" (p. 347 and index). Moreover, where completeness is an aim, one wonders at finding no reference to Schevill's excellent treatise on *Ovid and the Renaissance in Spain*, Berkeley, 1913, especially as this work supplements Mr. Crane's researches in a number of ways.¹ Nevertheless, these are minor matters, and scholarship is once more indebted to Professor Crane for an interesting and illuminating treatise.

As is well known, *courtois* society made its first appearance in the south of France about the twelfth century. Background and climate alike, survivals of Greek culture and the Christian feudal veneration of woman in a glowing Provençal atmosphere, all this led to the establishment of the social relations which we have come to regard as "polite." The Troubadour lyric and the Old French romance are the earliest literary evidence of the fact. Without following Mr. Crane into the remoter origins, we may note that William IX, Count of Poitiers (1071–1127), is the first to mention the love debate as a social diversion:

E si'm partetz un juec d'amor
No suy tan fatz
No'n sapcha triar lo melhor
D'entre'ls malvatz.

The oldest *tenson* is of about 1137, and of this lyric form the most popular and widespread variety is the *joc-partit*. Among the numerous questions propounded in it, several persist into later literature, while the "question"

¹ See Schevill's chapter on the Ovidian tale in Italy, particularly his treatment of Boccaccio. On neo-Platonism, Crane might also have cited Arnaldo della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di Firenze*. As for Burckhardt, *Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Crane, p. 164), this work appeared in a tenth edition, in 1908.

as a type is a continuous phenomenon throughout the periods Mr. Crane discusses. A recurrent example, mentioned in Provençal, Italian, and French literatures, is: Which person should a lover choose, a maid, a wife, or a widow? or, to cite one of the oldest, Which is preferable, the love of a clerk or that of a knight (gentleman)? The latter question occurs in the early *Concilium Amoris* (*Concile de Remiremont*, end of the eleventh century), and being adjudicated there by a female cardinal sent by the god of love it naturally raises the problem of the so-called courts of love and their actual existence in the Middle Ages. Wisely, Mr. Crane here joins the ranks of the skeptics, although—again judiciously—he finds in the important treatise of Andreas Capellanus evidence that such love decisions were made only in the spirit of diversion, as an aristocratic pastime. Similarly, the Portuguese *Cancioneiro de Resende*, containing the “most extensive question in existence,” whether silent sorrow (*cuydar*) or audible sighs (*sospirar*) betray the deeper pain, is clearly the toying with an idea rather than an attempt at a serious judgment actually pronounced. But it was under the blue skies of Italy that the *joc-partit* or love debate, transplanted from Provence, had its greatest elaboration. At the brilliant court of Naples, about the middle of the fourteenth century, Boccaccio received the impulse which has made his *Filocolo* and *Decameron* the repositories of “questions” and “stories” turning upon the subject of love and social conduct generally. “All the diversions,” says Professor Crane, “of the most elegant society since that day are found there—music and dancing and talk—what more have we now?” And, as he might have added, these diversions were on a more aesthetic plane than now.

Of the two works mentioned, the greater attention is given to the *Filocolo*; first, because it defines the setting later developed in the *Decameron*; and second, because the thirteen questions it contains are differentiated according to the manner of earlier and later discussions. What follows the *Filocolo* is essentially an adaptation of its method to the neo-Platonism of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and to the various books on courtesy and manners in which the Renaissance is rich.

For their influence on France, the two outstanding books of this later period are: Castiglione's *Cortegiano* (begun in 1508 but not published until 1528) and Guazzo's *Civil Conversazione*, or *Polite Society* (1574). Castiglione, idealizing the courtier against the setting of the court of Urbino, supplies, by means of a debate, the elements which in the seventeenth century constituted the French *honnête homme*. This fact is perhaps amply known; but in connection with Mr. Crane's general argument it gains momentum. As for Guazzo, his treatise, which deals first with the theory and then with the practice of etiquette, was translated into French by both Chappuys and Belleforest, and further inspired Sorel's *La maison des jeux*, Mlle de Scudéry and *précieux* society in general, which was also indebted to Guazzo for the idea of the *Guirlande de Julie*.¹

¹ Borrowed from Guazzo's *Ghirlanda della contessa Angela Bianca Beccaria* (1595).

Be it said in passing that Mr. Crane's treatment, which is chronological, lists and discusses every important treatise from Francesco da Barberino's *Del Reggimento e Costumi di Donne* to Harsdörfer's *Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele* (1641) and Campillo de Bayle's *Gustos y Disgustos del Lantiscar de Cartagena* (1689). The latest English reference is to an article on parlor games in the *Spectator*, October 2, 1712.

If from all this material we selected an illustrative example, the most significant would probably be Guazzo's reference (see Crane, p. 386) to the question whether a solitary life is superior to a life of society. For this is the problem of Molière's *Misanthrope*. The seventeenth-century custom of drawing portraits in speech and deducing maxims therefrom is virtually in Guazzo; but what makes his *Civil Conversazione* of special interest for the study of Molière is its account of the Game of Solitude. In this game various characters are called upon to give reasons for seeking the solitude of a "desert," and the first reason stated is that society contaminates the soul. The analogy with Molière's atrabilious Alceste is, of course, manifest.

Thus, the value of Mr. Crane's book is that it gives us the material with which to reconstruct the social life of the Renaissance. In spite of its great length, the treatise has the limitations of a sketch, but this is explained by the boundless nature of the subject, a field in which Mr. Crane has long been a successful explorer.

On the other hand, Mr. Wright's book is not "an encyclopaedic survey" but a restrained outline of that finished product: French classicism. Like Mr. Guérard's, it is divided into two parts, here called respectively: Part I, "The Foundations," and Part II, "The Structure." There are six chapters to each part, and the whole constitutes an admirable *Défense et Illustration* of the entire movement (political, social, and literary), nobly and simply expressed. Mr. Wright likes classicism, and he likes it according to the classical temper, with a sense of balance and distinction. When he tells us that the French incline not to totality but to "intelligibility," he is sound, and this soundness permeates his appraisal of the period. Altogether his treatise is an indispensable aid to every serious student of seventeenth-century culture and thought.

"In the seventeenth century," says Mr. Wright, "French civilization reached, in letters as in politics, a harmony of *organization*." Not that this principle affected all phases of society or any one phase inclusively, since, from the material point of view, later ages were better organized. Yet the guiding force of the age was "the harmonious interworking" of the "component elements of French social and political life." This social and political life was, of course, aristocratic or *courtois*. What distinguishes it from the medieval past is its complete transfusion with the *spirit* of antiquity.

From the Ancients the Renaissance derived two essential momenta: (1) the idea of the city as a cultural unit, "the citizen exercising his highest

function, tends towards a harmonious and well-regulated life of culture, in which all of his faculties have full play"; and (2) the realization that art and literature are the expression of beauty and vigor in a *finite* world: classicism is the life of reason; it verifies ideas by facts; it seeks the general in the particular; its universe is limited and controlled; it possesses no striving for the unattainable, no emotional *hinaus ins Freie*, and therefore no ethical or aesthetic disruption.

Beauty is truth, truth beauty,—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know,

says Keats, re-echoing the classical Boileau.

In treating the "foundations," Mr. Wright keeps these facts clearly in mind. His second chapter on Platonists and Aristotelians is one of his best. Had the concision of his work permitted a more historical treatment, it would have been useful to explain how Platonism furnished the inspiration, and Aristotelianism the control or form, of the French classical movement: the *Pléiade* and even Corneille being largely Platonic, and the *grands classiques* prevailingly Aristotelian. As it is, Mr. Wright points out that both Plato and Aristotle saw in beauty "the expression of the ideal in forms of sense" but arrived at the goal by different methods, the one by deduction from the world of ideas, the other by induction from the world of nature. In either case, however, the factor of "reason" is fundamental, since it is through reason that the Platonist reaches "true intuitions," and it is the rational faculty in man which, according to Aristotle, works out Nature's unfulfilled intentions. Thus, while there is "intuitive imagination in classicism as well as in romanticism," it is superimposed on rationalism, and classicism is primarily intellectual.

Coming to "the theories of the *Pléiade*" (chap. iii) Mr. Wright shows the Platonic strain in the *Défense*, especially the doctrine of assimilation and innutrition so similar to the Platonic notions of *methexis* and *anamnesis*, which Du Bellay, however, derived through Cicero, Horace, Quintilian, and, we might add, Sperone Speroni and Trissino. The *Pléiade* grafts numerous elements, some of which are fairly incompatible, on the parent French stock. Chief among these are Hellenism, Alexandrianism, the encyclopaedic eagerness, and Italianism, especially Petrarchism. In a footnote (p. 40) Mr. Wright says: "Ronsard saw in the poet a demi-god, Malherbe and Boileau a man." No better distinction could be made. But although the welter of *Pléiade* striving was considerable, Mr. Wright's fourth chapter appears somewhat to miss the native opulence of Ronsard's muse, his extraordinary virtuosity, as well as the crystalline quality of Du Bellay's best verse. While it is true also that French Renaissance tragedies "elaborate a suffering supposedly tragic or *atrox*," such a designation is scarcely fair to a type of tragedy of which *King Lear* is after all an illustration. Moreover, the last two chapters in Part I dealing mainly with the transition to the seventeenth century and the generation of 1660, are perhaps juster to the

lesser lights than to such pioneers as Montaigne, Malherbe, and Mme de Rambouillet. Amyot receives but incidental reference; Montaigne's relativism is stated, but scarcely his function in defining the province of classicism: (1) in its identification of human traits, (2) in its amateur spirit, and (3) in its acceptance of tradition as an ethical standard. Whether it is right to say of so lyrical a genius as Pascal that he was "preoccupied like Descartes with thought," is at least open to question. A reference to Pascal's *c'est sortir de l'humanité que de sortir du milieu* (*Pensées*, 378) would, if carried back to Montaigne where it originates, have given the reader a better perspective than this section of the book permits.

As for Part II, the "structure" of classicism appears in the following sections: characters and persons ("characters and types" would have been clearer), principles, and lastly *genres*: these are subdivided into the drama, other poetical forms, prose forms, and art.

A word on each of these features. Louis XIV, as the presiding character of the age, is shown in all his majesty and effulgence. Similarly, the *honnête homme*, as the dominant type, is discussed with accuracy and discrimination. Here Cléante's statement in *Tartuffe*:

Les hommes la plupart sont étrangement faits!

Dans le juste milieu on ne les voit jamais,

is used to advantage, although Mr. Wright is correct in quoting La Rochefoucauld's *celui qui ne se pique de rien* as the best definition of the actual type. Historically, he might have added, the urbanity of the type is related to the Italian *sprezzatura* or aloofness, a trait of which Molière's Don Juan is an exaggeration.

As to principles, Mr. Wright justly emphasizes the Reason, since the imitation of the Ancients was justified because they conformed with it. Thus *le bon sens* is merely the practical reason, just as taste is reasoned art, and *le bel esprit*, according to Bouhours, *le bon sens qui brille*. So, too, nature is to the classicist primarily *human nature*; and if we transcend the microcosm it is "a coherent system of laws expressive of the social order and best exemplified in the life of civilized countries and their capitals." In other words, classicism holds sway *in urbe et orbe*; the two places are identified; turning to Malebranche, Mr. Wright would have found that this writer promises the devout Christian a rationalized paradise like a formal garden by Le Nôtre.

In conformity with these principles, the classicist worked out the rules of *genre*; these consisted of the drama and prose forms rather than of the lyric and the epic, although the latter was the one "ignominious failure" of the century. The steps whereby the law of verisimilitude becomes the essence of the dramatic poem are carefully traced, and its bearing on Corneille, Racine, and Molière is adequately sketched. Possibly the treatment of Corneille would have been clearer if Mr. Wright had dwelt on the distinction between the classical and preclassical periods: certainly, in dealing

with "admiration" as a dramatic emotion, he fails to note Corneille's indebtedness to Minturno, and the fact that "admiration" is a necessary feature of the romanesque (see the heroic novel) as it had been of the triumphant Italian Renaissance. Furthermore, Molière's neglect of the rules is appreciated, although it might have been stated that his treatment of character, not as passion or incident but as elemental nature, tends to exceed the classical formula. At the same time, it would be hard to find elsewhere as good an appraisal of the Abbé d'Aubignac's *Pratique du théâtre*, and of the crisis-drama of Racine. In d'Aubignac, says Mr. Wright, "verisimilitude amounts to conformity with the feelings of the spectators," and "these must not be jarred, even at the cost of historical accuracy." In this way the dramatic unities, that long incubation of Renaissance criticism, make for the sublimated universality of the classical, literary ideal. As seen in Racine, the dramatic apparatus is reduced to a minimum; "his tragedies offer us a simple but impressive plot (*peu d'incidents et peu de matière*); "by individual cases drawn from mythology or history are illustrated the great truths of life, as valid now in the seventeenth century, as in the days of Pyrrhus or of Nero." There is a striking analogy between such drama and a "maxim" by La Rochefoucauld, or a "thought" by Pascal. Speaking of his own *Caractères*, La Bruyère said:

Je suis presque disposé à croire qu'il faut que mes peintures expriment bien l'homme en général, puisqu'elles ressemblent à tant de particuliers, et que chacun y croit voir ceux de sa ville ou de sa province.

Further than this, literary classicism could not go. Fittingly, Mr. Wright's book closes with an account of the "classical precepts" in the allied field of art.

WILLIAM A. NITZE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Flaubert and Maupassant: A Literary Relationship. By AGNES RUTHERFORD RIDDELL. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1920. Pp. x+120.

Although the literary relationship of Flaubert and Maupassant has so long been taken as a matter of course, it seems not previously to have appealed to anyone as a subject for a doctoral dissertation. It goes without saying that the subject well deserves the careful, detailed, thoroughly painstaking study that Miss Riddell has given it.

Her dissertation is divided into six chapters.

Chapter i sums up the known facts of the personal intimacy of Flaubert and Maupassant and concludes that, since the work of the seven years of apprenticeship has not been preserved, "we must seek for the literary influence then in considerable measure . . . in the general application by the latter, throughout his subsequent work, of the principles inculcated by the former" (p. 9).

In chapter ii the author studies the theories of Flaubert and of Maupassant regarding life. After noting many similarities in the circumstances of their lives, she wisely recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing between influence and mere correspondence (p. 12). Hence she seeks for "the more concrete instances of similarity" (*ibid.*). She finds that the critics give her little help, but they generally agree that "such influence as exists is observable chiefly in Maupassant's earlier work, before he had quite evolved his own method" (*ibid.*). Since "he was not eminently inventive . . . in the acceptance of suggestions afterwards to be worked out in his own way, we see possibilities for influence upon him" (pp. 13-14). Moreover, "the two authors make definite statements regarding similar theories, beliefs, and likes or dislikes" (p. 14), similarities which are summed up at the end of the chapter as follows: "The environment of Flaubert and Maupassant tended to give them a pessimistic outlook, which expresses itself in their contempt for the world and for man, especially for the 'bourgeois.' Government, religion, womankind, all come under their scorn. In the midst of the general stupidity the literary man is a martyr for his cause. On the contrary, love of external nature furnishes to each the satisfaction which he does not find in man" (p. 20).

In chapter iii Miss Riddell points out in the two authors similar theories on literary procedure, but does not overlook differences, as well as similarities, in practice.

Chapter iv studies "additional literary procedures employed by both which, for the most part, they share in common with the other realists of the day" (p. 38). We may readily accept Miss Riddell's sensible conclusion that "it has not been intended . . . to attribute to them more than the weight of cumulative testimony when taken in conjunction with other evidence presented for the relationship of Flaubert and Maupassant" (p. 62).

In chapter v the author finds many interesting similarities in "plot, incident, characterization, ideas, and wording" (p. 63). In commenting upon similarities in description of details connected with death, Miss Riddell is careful to observe: "Scrutiny, however, fails to reveal any distinctive likenesses, resemblances being confined to the universal circumstances and concomitants of this human experience" (p. 81). The author seems to us less happy in her statement that "there are scattered here and there throughout the works of Maupassant phrases which, while not corresponding definitely to any particular phrases of Flaubert's, have yet a certain Flaubertian suggestion" (p. 103). In this manner, after months of looking for similarities in Flaubert and Maupassant, one may indeed go far, but it is a dangerous and an unconvincing method which Miss Riddell herself fortunately is not much given to following. We remember that she had previously stated her intention of seeking for "the more concrete instances of similarity" (p. 12).

Chapter vi sums up the content of previous chapters and then continues to argue for the suggestive type of influence rather than for set imita-

tion. Miss Riddell says: "It seems as if the pupil, trained for years by the master, and brooding, as he must have done, both during that period and in subsequent days of remembrance, over the monuments of that master's achievement, had absorbed so thoroughly the essentials of the latter's thought and expression that he reproduced them almost unconsciously" (pp. 109-10). This is a sane and balanced judgment which does the author credit.¹ Miss Riddell further shows that she has not lost her balance when she says: "It goes without saying that a considerable portion of Maupassant's work is, of course, distinctively his own" (p. 110). She calls attention also to the influence of "their day and generation" upon both, to the possible influence of Balzac, Zola, Daudet, and to "other writers" who are, unfortunately, not named. Here Professor Olin H. Moore might be of help with his article on "The Literary Relationships of Guy de Maupassant," published before Miss Riddell's thesis, though written later.² Miss Riddell's final conclusion is that "when all allowances have been made, however, it yet remains true that Maupassant is the disciple of Flaubert and owes to that master's influence much that is best in his own work" (p. 110).

Miss Riddell's conclusions are moderate and sane. It is perhaps rather surprising that, after mentioning that Maupassant's later work was less influenced by Flaubert, she does not return to develop the idea in detail. Should not just such a study as hers furnish the evidence needed, if considered chronologically, to determine the truth or falsity of the generally accepted opinion? It might be worth noting also that the very "unbookishness" of Maupassant would seem to make him especially susceptible to the word-of-mouth teaching of his friend.³ Maupassant himself tells us that from Bouilhet and Flaubert he got persistency in literary effort, "la force de toujours tenter."⁴ Finally, Miss Riddell's study serves to show that Flaubert's influence helped Maupassant to learn, not merely *how* to write, but even in many cases *what* to write, since from the former came many characters and episodes as well as opinions and methods of literary procedure.

Some one, perhaps Miss Riddell herself, should now be able to tell us with greater precision than before just how great is the *originality* of Maupassant, the degree to which his genius is distinctive, for that it is distinctive we can still hardly doubt.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

¹ On this same page occurs a repetition of the argument criticized in our discussion of chap. v, p. 103. The same criticism would apply here, but the argument seems not to have led the author seriously astray.

² *Modern Philology*, XV (1918), 645-62.

³ Of course not all of Flaubert's teaching was by word of mouth.

⁴ Maupassant, *Le Roman* (Pierre et Jean), p. 20.

heaven. The same question is asked of Menippus, and the answer is substantially the same as the one given by the *cojuelo*.

Quevedo's influence is far greater. Generally, it may be said that there are few characters satirized in *El Diablo Cojuelo* for which a parallel may not be found in either the *Sueños* of Quevedo or in some of his verses.

A careful analysis will show that the theme of the first four *trancos* of *El Diablo Cojuelo* is similar to that of Quevedo's *El Mundo por de Dentro*. This *Sueño* is the only one which has a continuous thread: the same characters continue throughout. Quevedo is guided along the *Calle Mayor* of the world, which is Hypocrisy. This is exactly what happens to Don Cleofas in *El Diablo Cojuelo*, where we have a more detailed description of this same street. The *calle de gestos, casa de locos, pila de dones*, and ancestral wardrobe described by Guevara are but the fruit of hypocrisy. Rodríguez Marín has pointed out (p. 229, l. 1) that the funeral described by Guevara in *tranco VIII* is similar to that described by Quevedo in *El Mundo por de Dentro*. The following are a few of the many passages in *El Diablo Cojuelo* which may have been suggested by Quevedo. The escape of the *cojuelo* from the flask recalls a passage in *Zahurdas de Pluton* (*Biblioteca de Autores españoles*, 310b). The opening lines of *tranco II*, *Quedo don Cleofas absorto en aquella pepitoria humana, de tanta diversidad de manos, pies y cabezas*, recall Quevedo's description of Madrid:

De ese famoso lugar,
Que es pepitoria del mundo,
En donde pies y cabezas
Todo esta revuelto y junto [*B.A.E.*, t. lxix, pág., 209b]

Again, in *tranco VII*, Guevara's description of Fortuna and her train is undoubtedly inspired by Quevedo's Romance upon the same subject (*B.A.E.*, t. lxix, pág. 204b). Guevara's *premdticas*, in *tranco X*, are similar to those which Quevedo gives in *El Buscón*, chapter x. The *cojuelo's* account of his visit to Constantinople and his return through Italy, touching in Venice, Naples, Genoa, Florence, and parts of Germany, is but a concise paraphrase of Quevedo's treatment of the conditions in these cities. See *La Hora de Todos*, etc., Nos. 35, 33, 32, 34. The order is the same, though inverse, for the *cojuelo* made his visits while returning to Spain.

Finally, I would suggest the following as an addition to the note on the *cuba de Sahagun*: Lopez de Ubeda in *La Pícara Justina* (1605) tells us that this well-known and most ancient vat was located at Sahagun, a town in the province of Leon, famous for a Benedictine monastery dating back to the ninth century and restored in the eleventh. Hence Guevara's allusion "y no profeso." The name Sahagun is in reality derived from San Facundo.

E. R. SIMS

A Short Italian Dictionary. By ALFRED HOARE. Cambridge: The University Press; and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Vol. I, Italian-English, 1918, pp. xxviii+443. Vol. II, English-Italian, 1919, pp. vi+294.

Mr. Hoare's large and costly *Italian Dictionary* was reviewed in *Modern Philology*, XIV, 429-30. Its use as a reference work for some three years has yielded abundant proof of its thoroughness, its accuracy, and its general excellence.

The need of a cheaper edition has now been met; the dictionary thus becomes much more accessible to teachers and to students.

The first volume is an abridgment of the Italian-English part of the quarto edition; but the loss of material is not so large as one might expect. Some forty thousand words are treated, as against some fifty thousand in the original edition. Space is saved by the omission of the words least important from the point of view of the average user of the dictionary, by the shortening of definitions, by the omission of etymologies, and by the plan of grouping within a single paragraph words built upon a single unvarying stem.

The introductory pages on the conjugation of Italian verbs constitute an unnecessary duplication of material available in ordinary Italian grammars, and are open to adverse criticism in several points of detail.

The second volume is an expansion of the English-Italian part of the quarto edition. It contains some thirty thousand words—five thousand or so more than the earlier form. It is then the most comprehensive as well as the best English-Italian dictionary in existence. Its value would have been increased had the diacritic indications of pronunciation been used for all Italian words instead of being limited to proper nouns and adjectives.

This volume, like the other, is laudably generous in the treatment of idiomatic phrases. Here one may learn how to say in Italian, "The Daily Mail has a circulation of . . . copies," or "Tips are often quite a serious item in a young man's expenditures," or "Cambridge won the toss and chose the Surrey side"; or that to *catch out* is "Al giuoco di cricket, prender una palla fatta salire in aria dal batsman prima che cada in terra, terminando così l'innings di questo." But *baseball* is only "un certo giuoco americano."

ERNEST H. WILKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Classical Technology. Edited from Codex Lucensis 490 by JOHN M. BURNHAM, Professor of Latin, University of Cincinnati. Boston: Richard S. Badger, the Gorham Press, 1920.

The *Classical Technology* is a collection of recipes for making colors, inks, varnishes, and compounds of various sorts. It is the second work by our author in this field, the first, *Recipes from Codex Matritensis A 16*,

In chapter ii the author studies the theories of Flaubert and of Maupassant regarding life. After noting many similarities in the circumstances of their lives, she wisely recognizes the difficulty of distinguishing between influence and mere correspondence (p. 12). Hence she seeks for "the more concrete instances of similarity" (*ibid.*). She finds that the critics give her little help, but they generally agree that "such influence as exists is observable chiefly in Maupassant's earlier work, before he had quite evolved his own method" (*ibid.*). Since "he was not eminently inventive . . . in the acceptance of suggestions afterwards to be worked out in his own way, we see possibilities for influence upon him" (pp. 13-14). Moreover, "the two authors make definite statements regarding similar theories, beliefs, and likes or dislikes" (p. 14), similarities which are summed up at the end of the chapter as follows: "The environment of Flaubert and Maupassant tended to give them a pessimistic outlook, which expresses itself in their contempt for the world and for man, especially for the 'bourgeois.' Government, religion, womankind, all come under their scorn. In the midst of the general stupidity the literary man is a martyr for his cause. On the contrary, love of external nature furnishes to each the satisfaction which he does not find in man" (p. 20).

In chapter iii Miss Riddell points out in the two authors similar theories on literary procedure, but does not overlook differences, as well as similarities, in practice.

Chapter iv studies "additional literary procedures employed by both which, for the most part, they share in common with the other realists of the day" (p. 38). We may readily accept Miss Riddell's sensible conclusion that "it has not been intended . . . to attribute to them more than the weight of cumulative testimony when taken in conjunction with other evidence presented for the relationship of Flaubert and Maupassant" (p. 62).

In chapter v the author finds many interesting similarities in "plot, incident, characterization, ideas, and wording" (p. 63). In commenting upon similarities in description of details connected with death, Miss Riddell is careful to observe: "Scrutiny, however, fails to reveal any distinctive likenesses, resemblances being confined to the universal circumstances and concomitants of this human experience" (p. 81). The author seems to us less happy in her statement that "there are scattered here and there throughout the works of Maupassant phrases which, while not corresponding definitely to any particular phrases of Flaubert's, have yet a certain Flaubertian suggestion" (p. 103). In this manner, after months of looking for similarities in Flaubert and Maupassant, one may indeed go far, but it is a dangerous and an unconvincing method which Miss Riddell herself fortunately is not much given to following. We remember that she had previously stated her intention of seeking for "the more concrete instances of similarity" (p. 12).

Chapter vi sums up the content of previous chapters and then continues to argue for the suggestive type of influence rather than for set imita-

tion. Miss Riddell says: "It seems as if the pupil, trained for years by the master, and brooding, as he must have done, both during that period and in subsequent days of remembrance, over the monuments of that master's achievement, had absorbed so thoroughly the essentials of the latter's thought and expression that he reproduced them almost unconsciously" (pp. 109-10). This is a sane and balanced judgment which does the author credit.¹ Miss Riddell further shows that she has not lost her balance when she says: "It goes without saying that a considerable portion of Maupassant's work is, of course, distinctively his own" (p. 110). She calls attention also to the influence of "their day and generation" upon both, to the possible influence of Balzac, Zola, Daudet, and to "other writers" who are, unfortunately, not named. Here Professor Olin H. Moore might be of help with his article on "The Literary Relationships of Guy de Maupassant," published before Miss Riddell's thesis, though written later.² Miss Riddell's final conclusion is that "when all allowances have been made, however, it yet remains true that Maupassant is the disciple of Flaubert and owes to that master's influence much that is best in his own work" (p. 110).

Miss Riddell's conclusions are moderate and sane. It is perhaps rather surprising that, after mentioning that Maupassant's later work was less influenced by Flaubert, she does not return to develop the idea in detail. Should not just such a study as hers furnish the evidence needed, if considered chronologically, to determine the truth or falsity of the generally accepted opinion? It might be worth noting also that the very "unbookishness" of Maupassant would seem to make him especially susceptible to the word-of-mouth teaching of his friend.³ Maupassant himself tells us that from Bouilhet and Flaubert he got persistency in literary effort, "*la force de toujours tenter*."⁴ Finally, Miss Riddell's study serves to show that Flaubert's influence helped Maupassant to learn, not merely *how* to write, but even in many cases *what* to write, since from the former came many characters and episodes as well as opinions and methods of literary procedure.

Some one, perhaps Miss Riddell herself, should now be able to tell us with greater precision than before just how great is the *originality* of Maupassant, the degree to which his genius is distinctive, for that it is distinctive we can still hardly doubt.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

¹ On this same page occurs a repetition of the argument criticized in our discussion of chap. v, p. 103. The same criticism would apply here, but the argument seems not to have led the author seriously astray.

² *Modern Philology*, XV (1918), 645-62.

³ Of course not all of Flaubert's teaching was by word of mouth.

⁴ Maupassant, *Le Roman* (Pierre et Jean), p. 20.

El Diablo Cojuelo, Luis Vélez de Guevara. Edición y Notas de FRANCISCO RODRÍGUEZ Y MARÍN. Madrid: Ediciones de "La Lectura," 1918.

In this new and "popular" edition of *El Diablo Cojuelo*, Rodríguez Marín has again demonstrated his extensive knowledge of Spanish tradition, folklore, and *refranes*. With few exceptions, all the difficult passages have been explained in copious notes, to which more detailed reference will be made later.

As compared with Bonilla y San Martín's last edition (1910), we may note some improvements and some new material. In the *prólogo* Rodríguez Marín has revised the biography of Guevara in the light of recent discoveries. Much of what has hitherto been accepted, the letter of Guevara's son in particular, is shown to be false. There is also a brief review of Guevara's *teatro* and an appreciation of Vélez by his contemporaries. Some of the material is new, but a part is accredited to Cotarelo y Mori's more extensive article along the same line. (See the *Boletín de la Real Academia*, December, 1916, and April, 1917.)

The most interesting feature of the *prólogo*, however, is the compilation of a large number of references to the *diablo cojuelo*: we are made acquainted with the *diablo* as he was known in popular song, folklore, and tradition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In keeping with the expressed hope of placing *El Diablo Cojuelo* within the reach of the public, Rodríguez Marín has modernized the spelling. This would hardly be tolerated in any other kind of edition. In a few cases the punctuation has been changed; the change always betters the reading of the passage.

The chief value of the present edition lies in the notes. It is true that Pérez y Gonzalez and Bonilla y San Martín had, in their previous editions, discovered most of the difficulties and explained many of them, but this does not detract from the value of Rodríguez Marín's work. All of the notes are re-written, and a large part of the material is new; they contain a wealth of detailed description that cannot be found elsewhere. A few of the best may be cited: *Rentoy*, p. 68, l. 6; *plazuela de Herradores*, 70, 4; *don extravagante*, 72, 19; *pastel de a cuarto*, 78, 7; note on poets in general, 102, 8; *rollo de Ecija*, 157, 7. The historical notes on pp. 107 and 109 contain material which would probably be inaccessible to one outside of Spain. The notes on *echar las habas* (p. 209) and on *andar el cedazo* contain the most detailed description of such practices that I have ever seen. The note on page 251, line 14, clears up an obscure reference: the same is true of the note on *carril de pozo*, page 258, line 13. Rodríguez Marín frequently takes issue with Bonilla y San Martín. He is not always successful, as will be

seen by comparing their notes on *boquila de riñon* (Rodríguez Marín, p. 66, l. 16; Bonilla y San Martín, p. 245).

In addition to the copious notes Rodríguez Marín has pointed out a number of *refranes* and *frases populares* which Guevara had ingeniously re-worked to suit his own purpose, thereby disguising them for the average reader. For example, page 28, line 15, *que camino del infierno, tanto anda el cojo como el viento* for *camino de Santiago*, etc.; 45, 15, *Aca estamos todos*; 48, 8, *y como ha cobrado buena fama, se ha echado a dormir*, for *cobra buena fama y echate a dormir*; 53, 1, *y trecientos cosas mas; porque al fin de años mil, vuelven los nombres por donde solian ir*, instead of *al fin de años mil, vuelven las aguas por donde solian ir*.

Another commendable feature of the present edition is the setting off of the verse in its proper form: pages 84, 118, 133, 157 (here Bonilla also), 200.¹

While on two occasions Rodríguez Marín frankly admits that he is unable to explain certain passages (pp. 52, l. 14; 90, 1), it will be seen that this edition leaves little or nothing to be desired in the way of notes: there are, however, many things lacking to make it a complete edition. In the *prólogo* Rodríguez Marín avoids a discussion of the date of composition; he also fails to mention Le Sage's *Le Diable Boiteux*. Nor does he discuss *El Diablo Cojuelo*. As yet this novel has not been assigned to any definite category: it certainly cannot be classified as a picaresque novel, nor can it be called a *novela de costumbres*. It partakes of the nature of both, and these two parts are distinct. Through *tranco* IV, with the exception of one picaresque adventure, we have a series of *cuadros de costumbres*. Part two, beginning with *tranco* V, is almost entirely picaresque. No explanation of the long list of nobles in *tranco* VIII is made. It is evident of course that many of them were mentioned merely because they were at court, but it is also certain that Vélez had closer connection with some of them. This is a piece of work that must be done in Spain.

The sources of the *Diablo Cojuelo* are but lightly touched upon. There is, first, the Lucianesque influence to which Guevara himself calls attention in the first *tranco*: the dialogue which he had in mind is *Icaro-Menippus*. In this dialogue Menippus relates how he had been able to fashion wings and take flight to the ethereal regions. While resting on the moon he was able to see all that passed on the earth. Still another of the dialogues, *The Dream*, is promising as source material. Simyllus is acquainted with the charm in the long feather of a cock's tail. Armed with this he opens the doors of his neighbors' houses and, invisible, sees all that is passing within. Other passages which have a Lucianesque flavor are page 49, lines 12-13, and *tranco* VI, where Don Cleofas and the *cojuelo* are resting under the stars. Don Cleofas asks his companion to relate what he saw during his fall from

¹ The following typographical errors are to be noted: the reference to note 205, l. 23, should be 205, 13; 205, 26, should be 205, 17.

heaven. The same question is asked of Menippus, and the answer is substantially the same as the one given by the *cojuelo*.

Quevedo's influence is far greater. Generally, it may be said that there are few characters satirized in *El Diablo Cojuelo* for which a parallel may not be found in either the *Sueños* of Quevedo or in some of his verses.

A careful analysis will show that the theme of the first four *trancos* of *El Diablo Cojuelo* is similar to that of Quevedo's *El Mundo por de Dentro*. This *Sueño* is the only one which has a continuous thread: the same characters continue throughout. Quevedo is guided along the *Calle Mayor* of the world, which is Hypocrisy. This is exactly what happens to Don Cleofas in *El Diablo Cojuelo*, where we have a more detailed description of this same street. The *calle de gestos, casa de locos, pila de dones*, and ancestral wardrobe described by Guevara are but the fruit of hypocrisy. Rodríguez Marín has pointed out (p. 229, l. 1) that the funeral described by Guevara in *tranco VIII* is similar to that described by Quevedo in *El Mundo por de Dentro*. The following are a few of the many passages in *El Diablo Cojuelo* which may have been suggested by Quevedo. The escape of the *cojuelo* from the flask recalls a passage in *Zahurdas de Pluton* (*Biblioteca de Autores españoles*, 310b). The opening lines of *tranco II*, *Quedo don Cleofas absorto en aquella pepitoria humana, de tanta diversidad de manos, pies y cabezas*, recall Quevedo's description of Madrid:

De ese famoso lugar,
Que es pepitoria del mundo,
En donde pies y cabezas
Todo esta revuelto y junto [*B.A.E.*, t. lxix, pág., 209b]

Again, in *tranco VII*, Guevara's description of Fortuna and her train is undoubtedly inspired by Quevedo's Romance upon the same subject (*B.A.E.*, t. lxix, pág. 204b). Guevara's *premticas*, in *tranco X*, are similar to those which Quevedo gives in *El Buscón*, chapter x. The *cojuelo's* account of his visit to Constantinople and his return through Italy, touching in Venice, Naples, Genoa, Florence, and parts of Germany, is but a concise paraphrase of Quevedo's treatment of the conditions in these cities. See *La Hora de Todos*, etc., Nos. 35, 33, 32, 34. The order is the same, though inverse, for the *cojuelo* made his visits while returning to Spain.

Finally, I would suggest the following as an addition to the note on the *cuba de Sahagun*: Lopez de Ubeda in *La Pícaro Justina* (1605) tells us that this well-known and most ancient vat was located at Sahagun, a town in the province of Leon, famous for a Benedictine monastery dating back to the ninth century and restored in the eleventh. Hence Guevara's allusion "y no profeso." The name Sahagun is in reality derived from San Facundo.

E. R. SIMS

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

A Short Italian Dictionary. By ALFRED HOARE. Cambridge: The University Press; and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Vol. I, Italian-English, 1918, pp. xxviii+443. Vol. II, English-Italian, 1919, pp. vi+294.

Mr. Hoare's large and costly *Italian Dictionary* was reviewed in *Modern Philology*, XIV, 429-30. Its use as a reference work for some three years has yielded abundant proof of its thoroughness, its accuracy, and its general excellence.

The need of a cheaper edition has now been met; the dictionary thus becomes much more accessible to teachers and to students.

The first volume is an abridgment of the Italian-English part of the quarto edition; but the loss of material is not so large as one might expect. Some forty thousand words are treated, as against some fifty thousand in the original edition. Space is saved by the omission of the words least important from the point of view of the average user of the dictionary, by the shortening of definitions, by the omission of etymologies, and by the plan of grouping within a single paragraph words built upon a single unvarying stem.

The introductory pages on the conjugation of Italian verbs constitute an unnecessary duplication of material available in ordinary Italian grammars, and are open to adverse criticism in several points of detail.

The second volume is an expansion of the English-Italian part of the quarto edition. It contains some thirty thousand words—five thousand or so more than the earlier form. It is then the most comprehensive as well as the best English-Italian dictionary in existence. Its value would have been increased had the diacritic indications of pronunciation been used for all Italian words instead of being limited to proper nouns and adjectives.

This volume, like the other, is laudably generous in the treatment of idiomatic phrases. Here one may learn how to say in Italian, "The Daily Mail has a *circulation* of . . . copies," or "Tips are often quite a serious *item* in a young man's expenditures," or "Cambridge won the *toss* and chose the Surrey side"; or that to *catch out* is "Al giuoco di cricket, prender una palla fatta salire in aria dal batsman prima che cada in terra, terminando cosí l'innings di questo." But *baseball* is only "un certo giuoco americano."

ERNEST H. WILKINS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A Classical Technology. Edited from Codex Lucensis 490 by JOHN M. BURNHAM, Professor of Latin, University of Cincinnati. Boston: Richard S. Badger, the Gorham Press, 1920.

The *Classical Technology* is a collection of recipes for making colors, inks, varnishes, and compounds of various sorts. It is the second work by our author in this field, the first, *Recipes from Codex Matritensis A 16*,

having appeared in the "University of Cincinnati Studies" in 1912. These recipes, according to Professor Burnham, originated in Alexandria about 300 A.D. They were brought to Italy and translated into Low Latin about 650 or possibly earlier. The Lucca MS was written at the close of the eighth century in various scripts (among them apparently the Visigothic). The scribe of the pages containing the recipes must have been an Italian. The immediate archetype of the Lucensis was Spanish; this is proved by various paleographical symptoms as well as by certain linguistic peculiarities in the text. Burnham assumes the year 725 as the approximate date of this Spanish MS.

The editor prints an exact transcript of the text, preserving the spelling, punctuation, word-separation (or lack of it) of the MS; only the abbreviations are expanded. In a brief commentary (pp. 77-180) some special points are discussed. A translation of the text follows (pp. 81-188); this must have given the editor as much trouble as the constitution of the text: bad Latin on bad Greek does not make for clearness. A Glossary (pp. 138-166) contains a list of new or rare words or meanings and unusual constructions. The editor notes about ninety words not found in our dictionaries and about forty words that are starred in the Romance dictionaries of Körting and Meyer-Lübke. Pages 166-70 are devoted to a discussion of the lexicography and syntax of the translation.

Both Latinists and Romance scholars should be grateful to Professor Burnham for this excellent work. It was especially desirable that a difficult MS like the Lucensis be edited by a trained paleographer.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

